National Library of Canada
Canadian Theses Service
Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Services des thèses canadiennes

CANADIAN THESES

THÈSES CANADIENNES

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL 339 (r. 86/01)

Canada

National Library of Canada
Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

49

TC –

0-315-22915-2

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE SERVICE – SERVICE DES THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

PERMISION TO MICROFILM – AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

• Please print or type – Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

AUTHOR – AUTEUR

Full Name of Author – Nom complet de l'auteur
CHAN-YOUNG CHUNG

Date of Birth – Date de naissance
September 21, 1936

Canadian Citizen – Citoyen canadien
☐ Yes / Oui ☑ No / Non

Country of Birth – Lieu de naissance
Korea

Permanent Address – Résidence fixe
379-47 Youngtong-Dong
Suwon-Si, Kyunggi-Do
Republic of Korea

THESIS – THÈSE

Title of Thesis – Titre de la thèse
Perceptions and Preferences of Teachers for
the Distribution of Decision Making Authority in Schools

Degree for which thesis was presented
Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée
Ph D.

Year this degree conferred
Année d'obtention de ce grade
1985

University – Université
University of Alberta

Name of Supervisor – Nom du directeur de thèse
Dr. D. Friesen

AUTHORIZATION – AUTORISATION

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to **microfilm** this thesis and to **lend** or **sell copies of the film.**

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de **microfilmer** cette thèse et de **prêter** ou de **vendre des exemplaires du film.**

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

ATTACH FORM TO THESIS – VEUILLEZ JOINDRE CE FORMULAIRE À LA THÈSE

Signature
C. Y. Chung

Date
August 7, 1985

NL-91 (r. 84/03)

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

PERCEPTIONS AND PREFERENCES OF TEACHERS FOR THE DISTRIBUTION OF DECISION-MAKING AUTHORITY IN SCHOOLS

by

CHAN-YOUNG CHUNG

©

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1985

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR CHAN-YOUNG CHUNG

TITLE OF THESIS PERCEPTIONS AND PREFERENCES OF TEACHERS FOR THE DISTRIBUTION OF DECISION-MAKING AUTHORITY IN SCHOOLS

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED FALL, 1985

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(SIGNED) C. Y. Chung

PERMANENT ADDRESS:
379-47, Youngwha-Dong
Suweon-Si, KyungGi-Do
Republic of Korea

DATED August 7 1985

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled PERCEPTIONS AND PREFERENCES OF TEACHERS FOR THE DISTRIBUTION OF DECISION-MAKING AUTHORITY IN SCHOOLS submitted by CHAN-YOUNG CHUNG in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY.

D. Friesen

Supervisor

G.A. Holdaway

M.A. Nay

Carl Miskel

External Examiner

Date: August 7, 1985

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to investigate the distribution of decision-making authority as perceived and preferred by teachers in fifteen urban schools in Alberta. The distribution was examined by the relative degree of involvement of the individual teacher, the staff group, and the administrator in determining action for fifteen tasks in schools. This study was also designed to examine (1) the discrepancy between the perceived and preferred involvement of each decision-making unit for each task, (2) the overall satisfaction of teachers with their involvement in decision making, (3) the relationship between the overall satisfaction of teachers and decisional deprivation of teachers for each task, and (4) the major sources of dissatisfaction of teachers with their involvement in decision making.

The researcher modified and augmented a questionnaire developed by Simpkins (1968). The questionnaire was sent to all 580 teachers in the selected fifteen schools. The total number of returns was 308 (53.0%), of which 298 (51.3%) were accepted for analysis.

The findings of this study indicate that teacher autonomy was perceived to be substantial with respect to tasks in the area of classroom management, whereas hierarchical control was perceived to be pervasive in matters outside classroom management. Collegial control was seen as weak regarding most of the tasks.

Second, the authority structure preferred by teachers was somewhat different from the existing structure. Teachers tended to prefer greater individual and collegial control over most school matters beyond the boundary of the classroom. This suggests that the zone of concern of teachers is not limited to the area of instructional decisions, but is extended to administrative matters of decisions which affect their work.

Third, decisional deprivation of teachers was found to be low in tasks in the area of classroom management, whereas a relatively high degree of decisional deprivation of teachers was identified concerning most tasks outside classroom management.

Finally, a negative relationship was found between the overall satisfaction of teachers with their involvement in decision making and the decisional deprivation of teachers. For tasks in the area of classroom management, no significant negative relationships were found between the overall satisfaction and the decisional deprivation of teachers, but significant negative relationships were identified for most tasks outside classroom management.

In general, teachers wished a considerable change in the distribution of decision-making authority in schools. They tended to prefer greater individual and collegial control over most school matters external to classroom management.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express sincere thanks to Dr.David Friesen, the thesis supervisor, for his assistance, advice, and encouragement throughout all stages of the study. Thanks are slso extended to Dr.E.A.Holdaway and Dr.W.H.Worth, committee members, for their helpful suggestions and encouragement.

The writer is also grateful to Dr.M.A.Nay, the committee member and Dr.C.G.Miskel, the external examiner, as well as to Dr.J.H.Balderson and Dr.H.W.Hodysh, committee members in the initial stage of the study.

The writer acknowledges, with thanks, the cooperation given by Dr.T.A.Blowers, the school principals, and all of the teachers in the Edmonton Public School District who participated in the study by completing the questionnaire.

The writer also extends thanks to Mrs.C.Prokop for her suggestions and unsparing help in dealing with a great amount of data.

Finally, the writer expresses appreciation to his wife, Hyun-Young and family for their patience and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

1 INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM 1

Introduction 1

Background 2

Statement of the Problem 4

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions 5

Purpose of the Study 5

Research Questions 6

Significance of the Study 7

Delimitations and Limitations 10

Definition of Terms 10

Organization of the Thesis 11

2 REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND 13

Introduction 13

Concept of Authority 13

Authority Structures in Formal Organizations 16

Bureaucratic and Human Relations Models 17

Professional Model 20

Authority Structures in Schools 23

Decision Making 27

Types of Decisions 29

Decision-Making Process 29

Styles of Decision Making 30

Participation in Decision Making 31

Rationale for Participation 32

Chapter Page

Considerations for Participation 35

Research Related to Decision-Making Authority in Schools 37

Simpkins's Study 37

Other Studies 39

Summary 43

3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 46

Introduction 46

Instrument 46

Validity of the Instrument 48

Reliability of the Instrument 52

Sample 53

Data Collection 56

Procedures 56

Returns of the Questionnaire 56

Analysis of Data 57

Summary 59

4 PERCEIVED DISTRIBUTION OF DECISION-MAKING AUTHORITY 61

Introduction 61

Perceived Involvement in Decision Making 61

Elementary School Level 62

Junior High School Level 64

Senior High School Level 66

Summary 68

Differences in Involvement in Decision Making by Type of School 69

Chapter Page

Individual Teacher as Decision-Making Unit 69

Staff Group as Decision-Making Unit 71

Higher Authority as Decision-Making Unit 73

Summary 73

Differences in Involvement in Decision Making by Demographic Variables 76

Male and Female 76

Length of Teaching Experience 78

Length of Training 82

Summary 86

Summary and Discussion 86

5 PREFERRED DISTRIBUTION OF DECISION-MAKING AUTHORITY 90

Introduction..90

Preferred Involvement in Decision Making 90

Elementary School Level 91

Junior High School Level 93

Senior High School Level 95

Summary 97

Differences in Preferred Involvement in Decision Making by Type of School 97

Individual Teacher as Decision-Making Unit 98

Staff Group as Decision-Making Unit 100

Higher Authority as Decision-Making Unit 100

Summary 103

Differences in Preferred Involvement in Decision Making by Demographic Variables 104

Chapter Page

Male and Female 105

Length of Teaching Experience 105

Length of Training 110

Summary 114

Summary and Discussion 115

6 DISCREPANCY BETWEEN PERCEIVED AND PREFERRED INVOLVEMENT IN DECISION MAKING 118

Introduction 118

Discrepancy between Perceived and Preferred Involvement in Decision Making 118

Elementary School Level 119

Junior High School Level 124

Senior High School Level 129

Summary 132

Differences in Degrees of Discrepancy by Type of School 134

Individual Teacher as Decision-Making Unit 134

Staff Group as Decision-Making Unit 136

Higher Authority as Decision-Making Unit 136

Summary 139

Differences in Degrees of Discrepancy by Demographic Variables 141

Male and Female 141

Length of Teaching Experience 143

Length of Training 148

Summary 148

Chapter Page

Percentages with Low and High Discrepancy in Decision-Making Involvement 152

Elementary School Level 153

Junior High School Level 157

Senior High School Level 158

Summary 159

Summary and Discussion 159

7 SATISFACTION OF TEACHERS WITH THEIR INVOLVEMENT IN DECISION MAKING 163

Introduction 163

Overall Satisfaction Level of Teachers with Their Involvement in Decision Making 163

Overall Satisfaction Levels of Teachers 166

Difference by Type of School 167

Difference by Male and Female 167

Difference by Length of Teaching Experience 167

Difference by Length of Training 167

Summary 167

Relationship between Overall Satisfaction and Decisional Deprivation 168

Major Sources of Overall Dissatisfaction of Teachers 171

Free Responses 175

Summary and Discussion 176

8 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS 180

Summary of the Study 180

Purpose of the Study 180

Theoretical Basis 180

Chapter Page

Research Methodology 183

Findings of the Study 184

Conclusions and Discussion 192

Implications 198

For Theory 198

For Practice 200

For Further Research 203

Concluding Statement 204

BIBLIOGRAPHY 206

APPENDIX A. The Instrument 215

APPENDIX B. Correspondence 222

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

3.1 Returns of Questionnaires from Participating Schools and Teachers 54

3.2 Description of Sample 55

4.1 Mean Involvement Scores of Three Decision-Making Units in Determining Action for Each Task as Perceived by Elementary School Teachers 63

4.2 Mean Involvement Scores of Three Decision-Making Units in Determining Action for Each Task as Perceived by Junior High School Teachers 65

4.3 Mean Involvement Scores of Three Decision-Making Units in Determining Action for Each Task as Perceived by Senior High School Teachers 67

4.4 Mean Perceived Involvement Scores of the Individual Teacher in Determining Action for Each Task by Type of School 70

4.5 Mean Perceived Involvement Scores of the Staff Group in Determining Action for Each Task by Type of School 72

4.6 Mean Perceived Involvement Scores of the Higher Authority in Determining Action for Each Task by Type of School 74

4.7 Mean Perceived Involvement Scores of Each Decision-Making Unit in Determining Action for Each Task by Sex 77

4.8 Mean Perceived Involvement Scores of the Individual Teacher in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Teaching Experience 79

4.9 Mean Perceived Involvement Scores of the Staff Group in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Teaching Experience 80

4.10 Mean Perceived Involvement Scores of the Higher Authority in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Teaching Experience 81

4.11 Mean Perceived Involvement Scores of the Individual Teacher in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Training 83

Table Page

4.12 Mean Perceived Involvement Scores of the Staff Group in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Training 84

4.13 Mean Perceived Involvement Scores of the Higher Authority in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Training 85

5.1 Mean Involvement Scores of Three Decision-Making Units in Determining Action for Each Task as Preferred by Elementary School Teachers 92

5.2 Mean Involvement Scores of Three Decision-Making Units in Determining Action for Each Task as Preferred by Junior High School Teachers 94

5.3 Mean Involvement Scores of Three Decision-Making Units in Determining Action for Each Task as Preferred by Senior High School Teachers 96

5.4 Mean Preferred Involvement Scores of the Individual Teacher in Determining Action for Each Task by Type of School 99

5.5 Mean Preferred Involvement Scores of the Staff Group in Determining Action for Each Task by Type of School 101

5.6 Mean Preferred Involvement Scores of the Higher Authority in Determining Action for Each Task by Type of School 102

5.7 Mean Preferred Involvement Scores of Each Decision-Making Unit in Determining Action for Each Task by Sex 106

5.8 Mean Preferred Involvement Scores of the Individual Teacher in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Teaching Experience 107

5.9 Mean Preferred Involvement Scores of the Staff Group in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Teaching Experience 108

5.10 Mean Preferred Involvement Scores of the Higher Authority in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Teaching Experience 109

5.11 Mean Preferred Involvement Scores of the Individual Teacher in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Training 111

Table Page

5.12 Mean Preferred Involvement Scores of the Staff Group in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Training 112

5.13 Mean Preferred Involvement Scores of the Higher Authority in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Training 113

6.1 Discrepancy between Mean Perceived and Preferred Involvement Scores of the Individual Teacher in Determining Action for Each Task (Elementary School) 120

6.2 Discrepancy between Mean Perceived and Preferred Involvement Scores of the Staff Group in Determining Action for Each Task (Elementary School) 122

6.3 Discrepancy between Mean Perceived and Preferred Involvement Scores of the Higher Authority in Determining Action for Each Task (Elementary School) 123

6.4 Discrepancy between Mean Perceived and Preferred Involvement Scores of the Individual Teacher in Determining Action for Each Task (Junior High School) 125

6.5 Discrepancy between Mean Perceived and Preferred Involvement Scores of the Staff Group in Determining Action for Each Task (Junior High School) 126

6.6 Discrepancy between Mean Perceived and Preferred Involvement Scores of the Higher Authority in Determining Action for Each Task (Junior High School) 128

6.7 Discrepancy between Mean Perceived and Preferred Involvement Scores of the Individual Teacher in Determining Action for Each Task (Senior High School) 130

6.8 Discrepancy between Mean Perceived and Preferred Involvement Scores of the Staff Group in Determining Action for Each Task (Senior High School) 131

6.9 Discrepancy between Mean Perceived and Preferred Involvement Scores of the Higher Authority in Determining Action for Each Task (Senior High School) 133

Table Page

6.10 Comparison of Discrepancy Scores in Involvement of the Individual Teacher in Determining Action for Each Task by Type of School 135

6.11 Comparison of Discrepancy Scores in Involvement of the Staff Group in Determining Action for Each Task by Type of School 137

6.12 Comparison of Discrepancy Scores in Involvement of the Higher Authority in Determining Action for Each Task by Type of School 138

6.13 Comparison of Mean Discrepancy Scores in Involvement of Each Decision-Making Unit in Determining Action for Each Task by Sex 142

6.14 Comparison of Mean Discrepancy Scores in Involvement of the Individual Teacher in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Teaching Experience 144

6.15 Comparison of Mean Discrepancy Scores in Involvement of the Staff Group in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Teaching Experience 146

6.16 Comparison of Mean Discrepancy Scores in Involvement of the Higher Authority in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Teaching Experience 147

6.17 Comparison of Mean Discrepancy Scores in Involvement of the Individual Teacher in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Training 149

6.18 Comparison of Mean Discrepancy Scores in Involvement of the Staff Group in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Training 150

6.19 Comparison of Mean Discrepancy Scores in Involvement of the Higher Authority in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Training 151

6.20 Percentage with Low and High Discrepancy in Involvement of Each Decision-Making Unit for Each Task (Elementary School) 154

Table Page

6.21 Percentage with Low and High Discrepancy in Involvement of Each Decision-Making Unit for Each Task (Junior High School) 155

6.22 Percentage with Low and High Discrepancy in Involvement of Each Decision-Making Unit for Each Task (Senior High School) 156

7.1 Comparison of Mean Satisfaction Scores of Teachers with Their Involvement in Decision Making by Type of School 164

7.2 Comparison of Mean Satisfaction Scores of Teachers with Their Involvement in Decision Making by Sex 164

7.3 Comparison of Mean Satisfaction Scores of Teachers with Their Involvement in Decision Making by Length of Teaching Experience 165

7.4 Comparison of Mean Satisfaction Scores of Teachers with Their Involvement in Decision Making by Length of Training 165

7.5 Correlation Coefficients between Overall Satisfaction of Teachers and Decisional Deprivation of Teachers for Each Task by Type of School 169

7.6 Multiple Regression Analysis with Satisfaction with Decision Making as Criterion and Decisional Deprivation Scores as Predictors (Elementary School) 172

7.7 Multiple Regression Analysis with Satisfaction with Decision Making as Criterion and Decisional Deprivation Scores as Predictors (Junior High School) 173

7.8 Multiple Regression Analysis with Satisfaction with Decision Making as Criterion and Decisional Deprivation Scores as Predictors (Senior High School) 174

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The formal organization is a collectivity designed to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the efforts of human beings in order to accomplish specific goals. Its efficiency and effectiveness are thought to be partly determined by the degree to which the individuals participate in various tasks of the organization. The manner of participation is formally determined by the structure of the organization, the prime determiner of which is authority structure. Katz and Kahn (1978:57) defined authority structure as "the way in which the managerial system is organized concerning the sources of decision making and its implementation." Katz and Kahn (1978:58) pointed out two important rewards regarding the exercise of decision-making authority:

> (1) its exercise is in itself gratifying to the needs of people for participation and autonomy, and (2) it is instrumental in its power potential for achieving other objectives.

The distribution of decision-making authority is complex in organizations employing professionals partly because professionals deal with various complex tasks. Steers (1977:60-61) regarded the downward distribution of authority as "a key to improving both organizational performance and employee job satisfaction," since "most decisions would be made closer to their information sources, leading to increased flexibility of operation and increased divisional autonomy."

Since the distribution of decision-making authority is assumed to be closely associated with the productivity of organizations and the satisfaction of members, as well as with the stability and flexibility of organizations, it is a matter of continuing importance to determine the distribution of decision-making authority in schools.

Background

Over the past few decades, participation in decision making has been studied extensively. A wide variety of literature has indicated the positive aspects of subordinate involvement in decision making. Many reasons have been provided to support the involvement of subordinates in decision making. The reasons include (1) realizing democratic ideals (Dykes, 1964:38; Owens, 1970:105-106; Imber, 1983:39-41), (2) increasing organizational effectiveness (Likert, 1961:223-233; Steers, 1977:159), (3) respecting expertise and professionalism of personnel (Etzioni, 1964:76; Simpkins and Friesen, 1969:13), (4) making effective decisions (Drucker, 1967; Rogers, 1975:174; Hoy and Miskel, 1982:278), (5) increasing organizational commitment (Miles, 1965; Vroom and Yetton, 1973), (6) exercising legitimate authority (Barnard, 1954:165-166; Simon, 1961:125; Alutto and Belasco, 1972), and (7) meeting psychological needs of subordinates (Schein, 1980:64-70).

Organizational theory generally favors subordinate involvement in the decision-making process. When decisions are made with the active participation of subordinates closest to the point of implementation, an increase in the effective function of the organization seems apparent. According to Steers (1977:159),

> participative decision making represents one attempt to decentralize authority and influence throughout the organization. It is generally thought that such action will often lead to improved decision quality, increased commitment of members to decision outcomes, and increased satisfaction resulting from involvement. Such results are often felt to be associated with effective organizations.

Participative decision making is desired in schools because they are characterized by goal ambiguity, indeterminate technology, and lack of consensus and reliable criteria for evaluating outcomes. In other words, schools need wide participation of teachers in sharing information and ideas as well as in designing strategies. In addition, teachers aspire to professional autonomy, which requires an involvement in decision making on the issues which affect them.

Many studies indicated the positive results of teacher participation in school decision making. It is generally agreed that teacher involvement in the decision making increases teacher satisfaction with their work and develops better relationships between teachers and the principal, which further enhances the effectiveness of school activities for students.

Several studies have examined perceptions and preferences of teachers for participation in decision making. Most studies indicated that teachers generally desire more involvement in decision making.

Pitkoff (1981:2) indicated that during the last few decades, teacher participation in decision making has been often supported by teachers' associations, school boards, and superintendents of schools. According to Ratsoy (1968:14-15), the Alberta Teachers' Association has expressed support for increased teacher involvement in decision making.

Statement of the Problem

As noted above, increased teacher involvement in decision making has been generally desired by scholars and relevant organizations. However, the involvement of subordinates is determined according to various factors such as the nature of problems, characteristics of subordinates, and the internal and external environment. Under these circumstances, what is the distribution of decision-making authority as perceived and preferred by teachers in schools? To what extent does a discrepancy exist between perceptions and preferences of teachers for involvement in school decision making? What relationship exists between overall satisfaction of teachers with their involvement in decision making and the perceived decisional deprivation of teachers?

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

Purpose of the Study

This study was intended to investigate the distribution of decision-making authority as perceived and preferred by teachers in elementary, junior high, and senior public high schools in Edmonton, Alberta. A major purpose was to determine the perceived and preferred distribution of decision-making authority among the three decision-making units--the individual teacher, the formal staff group, and the higher official authority--regarding fifteen important tasks which are associated with the operation of the school instructional program. This study was also designed to examine (1) the discrepancy between the perceived and preferred involvement of each of the three decision-making units for each task, (2) the overall satisfaction levels of teachers with their involvement in decision making, (3) the relationship between the overall satisfaction of teachers and decisional deprivation of teachers for each task, and (4) the major sources of dissatisfaction of teachers with their decision-making involvement.

Research Questions

This study aimed to obtain information relevant to the following specific questions:

1. What is the distribution of decision-making authority perceived by teachers in the elementary, junior high, and senior high schools?
2. What significant differences exist in the involvement of each decision-making unit in determining action for each of the fifteen tasks in the perceptions of teachers categorized by type of school, sex, length of teaching experience, and length of training?
3. What is the distribution of decision-making authority preferred by teachers in the elementary, junior high, and senior high schools?
4. What significant differences exist in the involvement of each decision-making unit in determining action for each of the fifteen tasks in the preferences of teachers categorized by type of school, sex, length of teaching experience, and length of training?
5. What degree of discrepancy exists between the perceived and the preferred involvement of each of the three decision-making units regarding each of the fifteen tasks in the elementary, junior high, and senior high schools?
6. What significant differences exist in degrees of discrepancy among teacher groups categorized by type of school, sex, length of teaching experience, and length of training regarding the involvement of each decision-making unit for each task?
7. What degree of satisfaction do teachers feel with their involvement in decision making?
8. What significant differences exist in overall satisfaction levels of teachers with their involvement in decision making by type of school, sex, length of teaching experience, and length of training of the teachers?
9. What relationship exists between overall satisfaction of teachers with their involvement in decision making and decisional deprivation of teachers regarding each task?

10. What are major sources of overall dissatisfaction of teachers with their involvement in decision making?

Significance of the Study

The importance of an appropriate distribution of authority in the formal organization is widely acknowledged in terms of maintaining a balance between the needs of the organization (e.g., the accomplishment of organizational goals) and the needs of individuals (e.g., satisfaction of members) by a number of scholars such as Steers (1977), Katz and Kahn (1978), and Schein (1980). Regarding school systems, Lortie (1969:13) suggested the need for research on the distribution of decision-making authority with respect to specific tasks by stating that

> It appears that decision areas are subjected to differential definition, and that variable zoning exists in which, within the *same* dyad, initiatory power varies by topic. (One thinks of marriage, in which the husband has hegemoney over some issues, the wife over others, and discussion or argument arises over the rest.)

Belasco, Milstein, and Zaccarine (1976:135) also argued that "because school systems are populated by actors who possess professional aspirations, authority and control relationships are likely to be central organizational concerns."

Numerous studies have been reported regarding teacher participation in decision making in relation to specific variables such as job satisfaction, commitment, militancy, and alienation of teachers. However, few studies focussed on the distribution of decision-making authority among decision-making units with respect to specific tasks, as perceived and preferred by teachers in schools since Simpkins's study (1968).

Since Simpkins reported his study, some changes seem to have occurred in the distribution of decision-making authority. The nature of these changes are noted in the following excerpts from the professional literature. For example,

> There has been a clear and persistent movement towards more participative management techniques in the educational enterprise. Such an approach fundamentally changes the authority relationship between the teacher and the administrator (Belasco, Milstein, and Zaccarine, 1976:136).
>
> The dilemma between professional autonomy and centralized managerial systems will become more pronounced as the future produces both greater centralization and professionalization (Hoy and Miskel, 1978:274).
>
> Teachers are becoming more capable of exercising a domain of professional expertise and are demanding a new role for themselves which includes greater professional autonomy and a larger voice in the school system's decision-making process (Cox and Wood, 1980:6).

In the context of such changing distribution of decision-making authority in schools, this study was expected to contribute to the following aspects:

1. To refine research methodology developed by Simpkins (1968) for the investigation of the distribution of decision-making authority in school organizations.
2. To provide some new information on the perceived and

preferred distribution of decision-making authority, and perhaps some additional insights into the structure of authority in school organizations.

3. To identify significant changes in perceptions and preferences of teachers for the distribution of decision-making authority with respect to important tasks of schools since Simpkins's study (1968).
4. To provide information on and insights into the current and desired relationship between professional authority and administrative authority regarding important tasks of school organizations.
5. To provide information on the degree of decisional deprivation of teachers with respect to specific tasks.
6. To provide information on the relationship between overall satisfaction level of teachers with their decision-making involvement and decisional deprivation of teachers.

Regardless of the type of organization, the fundamental problem that administrators encounter is how to integrate the needs of the organization and the needs of individuals in order to maintain and improve organizational efficiency and effectiveness. The ultimate justification of this study is to provide new information which contributes to the maintenance and improvement of the efficiency and effectiveness of school organizations.

Delimitations and Limitations

1. The study was delimited to the sample of schools selected from the Edmonton Public School District in Alberta.
2. The study was delimited to the perceptions and preferences of teachers for the distribution of decision-making authority among the individual teacher, the formal staff group, and the higher official authority, regarding fifteen important tasks in schools. No attempt was made to study all possible variables related to decision-making authority. However, the study dealt with the relationship between overall satisfaction level of teachers and decisional deprivation of teachers for each task.
3. The limited opinions through the use of questionnaires could have biased the results.
4. Generalizations drawn from the study were limited to the schools selected for the study. However, the generalizations have some implications for other schools.

Definition of Terms

In this study, relevant terms were defined as follows:

Decision-making authority refers to legitimate and normative power to make decisions which control the behavior of others toward accomplishing organizational goals.

Decision-making unit refers to the individual teacher, the formal staff group, or the higher official authority which is supposed to exercise decision-making authority.

Professional authority refers to authority derived from knowledge and expertise in the area of one's professional work. Professional authority is supposed to be exercised by the individual teacher and/or the formal staff group.

Administrative authority refers to authority based on a hierarchy. The authority is supposed to be exercised by rank.

The individual teacher refers to the regular classroom teacher.

The formal staff group refers to the formally recognized staff group such as the total school teaching staff, a subject area department staff, or a grade staff.

The higher official authority refers to the administrative hierarchy above the level of teachers, such as school principal, central office official, Department of Education or representative.

Decisional deprivation refers to the difference between teachers' perceptions of the decision-making authority and their preferences as to what it should be.

Organization of the Thesis

In this chapter, the problem studied was introduced, the purpose of the study was stated, and research questions were posed. Included also were the significance of the study, the scope of the study, and the definitions of terms. Chapter 2 contains a review of the literature and the theoretical background. The research design is presented in Chapter 3. The results of the study are reported in Chapters 4 through 7. The final chapter includes a summary of the study, conclusions, and implications of the findings of the study.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

This chapter presents a review of the literature and research findings on decision-making authority and practices. First, attention is given to the concept of authority, authority structures in formal organizations, and authority structures in schools. Second, the nature of decision making and participation in decision making is reviewed. The chapter concludes with a summary and implications for the study of the distribution of decision-making authority in schools.

Concept of Authority

Numerous ideas and definitions have been presented regarding the concept of authority by a number of writers. This review of the concept is limited to some statements which are deemed relevant to this particular study.

Weber (1947:324) defined authority as "the probability that certain specific commands (or all commands) from a given source will be obeyed by a given group of persons." Weber (1947:324-328) observed that voluntary compliance is associated with legitimate commands, and classified three types of authority on the basis of their legitimacy:

(1) legal authority established on rational grounds; (2) traditional authority based on inheritance; and (3) charismatic authority derived from personal qualities and characteristics. Weber (1947:152) distinguished authority from power by stating that "power is the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance." According to Simon (1961:125), Rogers (1975,165), and Schein (1980:84-85), power and authority establish a reciprocal relationship between individuals or groups exercising power and authority, and those responding to power and authority.

The concept of authority presented by Weber is in accord with that of Barnard (1954:163) who posited that

> Authority is the character of a communication (order) in a formal organization by virtue of which it is accepted by a contributor to or "member" of the organization as governing the action he contributes; that is, as governing or determining what he does or is not to do so far as the organization is concerned.

He (1954:184) further said that

> Authority is another name for the willingness and capacity of individuals to submit to the necessities of cooperative systems. Authority arises from the technological and social limitations of cooperative systems on the one hand, and of individuals on the other. Hence the status of authority in a society is the measure both of the development of individuals and of the technological and social conditions of society.

Barnard (1954:165-166) also indicated four requirements for acceptance of authority by the individual: (1) understanding of the communication, (2) its consistency with the purpose of the organization, (3) its compatibility with one's personal interest as a whole, and (4) mental and physical ability to comply with it.

Similarly, Blau (1967:200) observed that "compliance is voluntary for the collectivity, but social constraints make it compelling for the individual." The power of a superordinate is regulated by social norms, which are the basis of legitimate power. Social norms seem to comprise the three types of authority classified by Weber. Similarly, Scott (1981:280) and Kelley (1980:437) regarded authority as legitimate and normative power. In the context of decision making, Rogers (1975:167) pointed out that "if the decisions are moderate and rational, the social acceptance may increase, thus enabling the authority to gain better acceptance of subsequent decisions." Thus, social norms circumscribe decision-making authority.

Simon (1961:125) elaborated the concept of authority in terms of decision making:

> "Authority" may be defined as the power to make decisions which guide the actions of another. It is a relationship between two individuals, one "superior," the other "subordinate." The superior frames and transmits decisions with the expectation that they will be accepted by the subordinate. The subordinate expects such decisions, and his conduct is determined by them.

Similarly, Rogers (1975:167) defined authority as "the right to make a particular decision and to command obedience, since the act of command always involves at least one such decision," distinguishing from power as "the ability to act effectively on persons or things, to take or secure favorable decisions which are not of right allocated to individuals or their roles." Authority, therefore, is the right to control the behavior of others, while power is the ability to influence the behavior of others with or without authority.

Baum (1961:26) sought to define authority operationally: "Authority, like decentralization, must be defined in terms of decision-making. Operationally, then, the authority amounts to the power to make a decision that will be accepted and carried out."

Power and authority are essential ingredients of decision making. Rogers (1975:165) stated that

> Generally, a decision is made by an individual or group with the expectation that the behavior of another person or group will be affected. The efficacy of the decision maker and the type of decision he may be allowed to make are determined by the power and authority he has. As such, power and authority are necessary ingredients of the decision-making process for they control the type of decision an individual will make and provide him with some expectation of having it cause the desired action.

In general, authority is seen as the legitimate and normative power to make decisions which control the behavior of others toward accomplishing organizational goals.

Authority Structures in Formal Organizations

Authority is the essential element of an organization in terms of controlling behavior of members in order to accomplish organizational goals. How, then, is authority allocated among individuals and groups? Who exercises authority in relation to various task activities of an organization? A general concept of authority structures can be formulated through reviewing bureaucratic, human relations, and professional models.

Bureaucratic and Human Relations Models

Scott (1981:55-101) viewed the bureaucratic model as a rational system and the human relations model as a natural system. The characteristics of the rational system are high goal specificity and high formalization involving a clear hierarchy of authority, centralization, highly structured rules and regulations, and efficiency. In contrast with such features, the natural system is characterized by goal multiplicity and an informal structure giving emphasis to decentralization, collegiality, and effectiveness. Specifically, Perrow (1973:3) presented the characteristics of the bureaucratic model as "centralized authority, clear lines of authority, specialization and expertise, marked division of labor, rules and regulations, and clear separation of staff and lines," whereas the human relations model values such characteristics as "delegation of authority, employee autonomy, trust and openness, concern with 'whole person,' and interpersonal dynamics." On the whole, the bureaucratic model is characterized by a centralized authority structure, whereas the human relations model emphasizes a dispersed authority structure.

Authority structures can be considered to be on a continuum from most centralized to most decentralized. Kaplan and Tusky (1977:45-46) have developed a typology of five models of authority relationships in terms of decision making: (1) bureaucratic, (2) representative bureaucratic, (3) consultative bureaucratic, (4) collegial, and (5) delegative. The typology is on a continuum from the most structured bureaucratic type (most hierarchical) to the delegative type (least hierarchical). The bureaucratic relationship is characterized by a definite hierarchical pattern between superordinates and subordinates. The representative bureaucratic relationship is similar to the pure form of the bureaucratic relationship, but the former includes more than one center of power, which negotiates decisions. In the consultative bureaucratic relationship, superordinates respect ideas and advice of subordinates. The collegial relationship is characterized by interaction among peers rather than between superordinates and subordinates. This type of relationship predominates in organizations employing professionals. Finally, the delegative relationship is characterized by the extensive autonomy of subordinates. The authority structure in any formal organization may consist of all or some of the five types of authority relationships, the mixture and degree of authority relationships differing from organization to organization, depending upon the philosophy, nature of the task and technology. For instance, Hasenfeld (1983:160) stated that "in recognition of the differential importance of various tasks and their requisite skills and expertise, the organization differentially allocates formal authority to them."

Hasenfeld (1983:161) observed that the distribution of authority in a formal complex organization is basically hierarchical in order to establish clear lines of responsibility and accountability, to provide a system of control to ensure staff compliance, and to provide coordination of numerous activities. However, the dynamics of the authority relationships cannot be properly expressed in a hierarchy. Hasenfeld (1983:161) argued that "the congruence between formal authority and the exercise of power is at best partial, because other sources of power in an organization are not necessarily expressed in formal authority." Authority relationships also seem to be task specific. Scott (1967:104) described such a characteristic:

> An important feature of our view of authority . . . is its emphasis on the extent to which authority rights may be task specific. A's authority rights over B may be limited to a specific task. In complex organizations, it is possible for an individual to participate in a large number of authority systems.

In general, the distribution of formal authority is basically hierarchical. However, there is an incongruence between formal authority and the exercise of authority.

Authority relationships may also be seen as task specific, which implies complex structures of authority in an organization.

Professional Model

Complex authority structures exist in organizations employing professionals. Lortie (1969:1-2) stated that authority structure is complex with a mixture of autonomy, collegial control, and hierarchical control. According to Etzioni (1964:76-77) and Mintzberg (1979:351), authority structures in professional organizations basically consist of two types: (1) administrative authority based on a hierarchy, and (2) professional authority derived from knowledge and expertise in the area of professional work. Etzioni (1964:77) asserted that

> the ultimate justification for a professional act is that it is, to the best of the professional's knowledge, the right act. He might consult his colleagues before he acts, but the decision is his. . . . The ultimate justification of an administrative act, however, is that it is in line with the organization's rules and regulations, and that it has been approved--directly or by implication--by a superior rank.

Etzioni (1964:75-93) analyzed variations in authority structures related to four types of organizations employing professionals. The analysis indicated that authority structures vary depending upon the degree of professionalization of members of an organization.

In full-fledged professional organizations, professionals exercise the major authority regarding goal definition and instrumental activities, whereas administrators have secondary staff authority. The final decisions are made by the various professionals and their decision-making bodies.

In semi-professional organizations, professionals have less autonomy, compared with those in full-fledged professional organizations. The semi-professionals do not have authority regarding the basic definition of the organizational goals, but may have secondary instrumental authority.

Scott (1981:222-223) described authority structures of two general types of professional organizations: (1) the autonomous professional organizations equivalent to full-fledged professional organizations and (2) heteronomous professional organizations corresponding to semi-professional organizations. In autonomous professional organizations, professionals have "considerable responsibility for defining and implementing goals, for setting performance standards, and for seeing to it that standards are maintained (p. 222)." A boundary is well demarcated between tasks of professionals and tasks of administrative officials. Decision-making authority is largely delegated to individual professionals who are subject to collegial control systems.

In contrast with professionals in the autonomous professional organizations, those in the heteronomous professional organizations have relatively limited authority over task decisions. Scott (1981:223) observed that

> The work of the professional participants takes place within a structure of general rules and of hierarchical supervision, but individual performers are given considerable discretion over task decisions, in particular, decisions concerning means or techniques.

Professional authority is based on the degree of expertise and ability of professionals to control the conditions of their work and to gain autonomy from administrative authority. Accordingly, authority structures vary depending on the degree of professionalization. According to Freidson (1977:22), the most highly developed professional groups can be distinguished from other professional groups by the degree to which they have exercised "the organized power to control themselves, the terms, conditions and content of their work in the setting where they peform their work."

In this respect, a conflict between professional authority and administrative authority is articulated by many writers. For instance, Hasenfeld (1983:164) indicated potential conflict of semi-professionals regarding incongruence between professional authority and administrative authority:

> Conflict with semiprofessionals is more likely to arise since they lack the power to back their claims for professional autonomy and control over their working conditions. Their claims for exclusive control over a sphere of activities and knowledge will be challenged both by the administrative authority and the more prestigious professionals.

Mintzberg (1979:363) indicated another perspective of multiple authority structures derived from properties of professional organizations:

> Since their outputs are difficult to measure, their goals cannot easily be agreed upon. So the notion of a strategy--a single, integrated pattern of decisions common to the entire organization--loses a good deal of its meaning in the Professional Bureaucracy.

In general, complex authority structures exist in organizations employing professionals. In such organizations, authority structures are characterized by the mixture of two basic types of authority: administrative authority and professional authority. Authority structures vary depending upon the degree of professionalization of members.

Authority Structures in Schools

Schools as emerging professional organizations are characterized by the combination of properties of both bureaucratic and human relations models. In general, authority structures consist of administrative authority based on a hierarchy and professional authority originating from knowledge and expertise. Professional authority is largely delegated to professionals. According to Simpkins and Friesen (1969), Lortie (1969:13), and Meyer and Rowan (1978:83-85), teachers have a substantial degree of autonomy regarding instruction in the classroom. However, teachers have very limited authority on administrative tasks external to classroom management.

Hasenfeld (1983:164-165) regarded teachers as semi-professionals since they have a lack of control over curriculum requirements, scheduling, and other decisions which influence much in their working conditions. However, Hoy and Miskel (1978:76) observed that teaching is progressing toward a full-fledged profession:

> The growth of theory and knowledge in teaching, the increased requirements for teacher education, the sense of responsibility for student welfare, strong professional associations, and increased claims for teacher autonomy provide the basis to legitimize teaching as a full-fledged profession. Behind this drive is the desire for increased status or for more control over work--not only more responsibility but more authority.

Etzioni (1964:76) described the importance of professional authority:

> Knowledge is largely an individual property; unlike other organization means, it cannot be transferred from one person to another by decree. Creativity is basically individual and can only to a very limited degree be ordered and coordinated by the superior in rank. Even the application of knowledge is basically an individual act, at least in the sense that the individual professional has the ultimate responsibility for his professional decision.

In this respect, administrative authority in schools should be exercised so as not to impede professional authority.

Some claim that highly bureaucratic authority in schools may be ineffective in accomplishing educational goals. For example, Ratsoy's (1973:169) findings in reviewing various studies of the relationship between bureaucratic structure and the effectiveness of schools are:

> (1) Supervisors are rated as less effective if they behave "bureaucratically"; (2) teacher satisfaction, on the average, is lower in schools where teachers perceive a high degree of bureaucracy; (3) student alienation is higher in schools where students perceive a high degree of bureaucracy; and (4) student achievement is lower where teachers view schools as emphasizing hierarchical structure.

MacKay (1964:5-8) and Lortie (1969:14-15) emphasized the importance of maintaining a balance between administrative authority and professional authority.

A wide variation of authority structures exists in schools. Hoy and Miskel (1978:63-65) formulated a typology of school organizational structures. It included these aspects: (1) Weberian structure, (2) authoritarian structure, (3) professional structure, and (4) chaotic structure. In the Weberian structure, professionalization and bureaucratization are complementary and both are high. In the authoritarian structure, bureaucratization is high and professionalization is low. A professional organization is characterized by a high degree of professionalization and a low degree of bureaucratization. In a chaotic structure, both bureaucratization and professionalization are low.

Authority structures are also viewed as formal authority and functional authority. Peabody (1962) distinguished formal authority from functional authority. Formal authority is based on legitimacy and position, whereas functional authority is derived from a variety of sources such as knowledge, expertise, and human relations skills. Functional authority means that technical competence is a basis of legitimate control regardless of hierarchical position. Formal authority is similar to administrative authority, while functional authority corresponds to professional authority.

Another perspective of authority structures of schools can be found in Weick's conceptualization of "loosely coupled" organizations. Weick (1976) described the characteristics as follows: several means to similar ends, loose coordination, loose regulation, operative independence, a lack of direct supervision by superiors, and delegation of discretion. Hasenfeld (1983:161-162) distinguished the authority structure of tightly coupled organizations from that of loosely coupled organizations:

> In general, the congruence between formal authority and the exercise of power will be greater in tightly coupled than in loosely coupled organizations. The former, characterized by a stable environment and a determinate technology, can establish authority structure that is not challenged by change, ambiguity, and uncertainty. In contrast, in loosely coupled organizations the formal authority structure is constantly undermined by environmental uncertainty, goal ambiguity, and technological indeterminacy. In loosely coupled organizations, a substantial incongruence exists between the formal authority system and the actual distribution of power. The same factors which shape the internal structure and the distribution of power in human service organizations, generate considerable divergence between the possession of formal authority and the actual exercise of power.

Schools as emerging professional organizations are characterized by a combination of properties of both bureaucratic and human relations models. The authority structures are generally characterized by a mixture of administrative authority and professional authority in relation to task activities. Administrative authority is exercised by a hierarchy, whereas professional authority is exercised by individual teachers or groups of teachers. A high degree of administrative authority may be ineffective in accomplishing educational goals. Thus, a balance between administrative authority and professional authority needs to be maintained.

Decision Making

Authority is viewed as the legitimate and normative power to make decisions. In this respect, authority can be elaborated in terms of decision making. According to Griffiths (1967:121-122), decision making is a key component of administration:

> the central function of administration is directing and controlling the decision-making process. It is not only central in the sense that it is more important than other functions . . . but it is central in that all other functions of administration can best be interpreted in terms of the decision-making process. It is becoming generally recognized that decision-making is the heart of organization and the process of administration.

Simon (1960:1) treated decision making as having the same meaning as managing. He (1961:1) observed that "the task of *deciding* pervades the entire administrative organization quite as much as does the task of *doing*--indeed it is integrally tied up with the latter." It can be seen that decision making is the core of the management of an organization.

Decision making is a complex process of making a choice. Drucker (1966:143) regarded a decision as a judgment or a choice between alternatives. MacCrimmon (1974:445-446) defined decision making as "a process involving both thought and action that culminates in an act of choice." Steers (1977:157) agreed that decision making is "a process of selecting among available alternatives." Decision making should be a rational process, wherein a choice is deliberately made from a number of alternatives.

Rational decision making is required for effective administration. An organization has specific goals and a great variety of decisions are made in order to accomplish them. Simon (1961:8-9) regarded the administrative processes as decisional processes since a major organizational function is to segregate certain decisional elements of members as well as to establish regular procedures for the selection and determination of the elements:

> The organization . . . takes from the individual some of his decisional autonomy, and substitutes for it an organization decision-making process. The decisions which the organization makes for the individual ordinarily (1) specify his function, that is, the general scope and nature of his duties; (2) allocate authority, that is, determine who in the organization is to have power to make further decisions for the individual; and (3) set such other limits to his choice as are needed to coordinate the activities of several individuals in the organization.

Types of Decisions

Simon (1960:5-8) identified two types of decisions: programmed decisions and nonprogrammed decisions. The programmed types are routine and repetitive decisions for which an organization can develop specific coping processes. The nonprogrammed types are decisions concerning previously unknown, unstructured, and consequential matters, which can be handled by general problem-solving processes.

For school organizations, Hasenfeld (1983:149) considered that nonprogrammed types of decision are prevalent because of goal ambiguity, indeterminate technology, and lack of reliable criteria for evaluating outcomes.

Decision-Making Process

Simon (1960:1) described three phases of decision making: "finding occasions for making a decision; finding possible courses of action; and choosing among courses of action." According to Griffiths (1967:132-133), the decision-making process consists of these six steps: (1) recognition, definition, and limitation of a problem; (2) analysis and evaluation of the problem; (3) establishment of criteria or standards for a solution; (4) data collection; (5) formulation and selection of the preferred solution; and (6) implementation of the preferred solution. Rogers (1975:182-184) described four steps in the process: (1)

search for goals; (2) formulation of alternative courses of action; (3) evaluation of outcomes; and (4) selection of alternative strategies. However, in actual situations, steps in the decision-making process cannot be clear-cut, because some of the steps are overlapping, skipped, or repeated. Generally speaking, decision making can be considered as a rational process consisting of the three steps indicated by Simon. In this study, focus is placed on the final act of selection from many alternatives.

Styles of Decision Making

Vroom and Yetton (1973:14) observed four styles of decision making: autocratic, consultative, group, and delegative. Steers (1977:159) pointed out that "such styles exist on a continuum from autocracy to total abdication by a superior." However, five styles of decision making seem to be distinguishable: (1) a manager deciding without consultation; (2) a manager deciding after consultation; (3) deciding by a vote of group members; (4) deciding by a consensus of group members; and (5) and individual member deciding. Therefore, those who may make a decision could be as follows: a manager, a group, or a single subordinate individual.

Participation in Decision Making

Participative decision making is regarded as the involvement of subordinates in the decision-making process on issues which affect them. It is intended to improve the quality of decisions and to increase the commitment of subordinates to the decisions made.

According to Steers (1977:159), participative decision making is regarded as one attempt to decentralize authority, and is related to improved decision quality, increased commitment of subordinates to decision outcomes, and increased satisfaction of subordinates.

Bartunek and Keys (1979:53) posited that:

> Much of the theory and research relevant to participative decision making in organizations have centered around two issues: the likelihood of high quality decisions in the organizations and the likelihood of acceptance and implementation of decisions by organization members. These two issues are not entirely separate: in many instances decision effectiveness depends on both quality and acceptance.

Regarding decision quality, Bartunek and Keys (1979:53-54) pointed out that "the greater the amount of relevant information the group members share, the better the problem solution is likely to be" and that the participative model has three important advantages:

> One is that participation implies influence over decisions, and influence is a primary mediator of acceptance (Wood, 1973). Another is that organizational members are more likely to understand decisions they help to formulate. A third is that, by virtue of their participation, organization members gain psychological "ownership" of the decision (Owens and Lewis, 1976).

Rationale for Participation

The main concern of an organization is to increase or maintain its effectiveness in regard to both tasks and subordinates. Griffiths (1962:34) asserted that

> the goals of an institution and the goals of individuals cannot be separated. Failure to achieve one results ultimately in the destruction of the other. To strike a balance between the two is the problem of the organizer.

Participative decision making is one way of creating a balance between organizational goals and individual goals.

The value associated with participative decision making corresponds to democratic ideals because the value is based on respect for the dignity, cooperative efforts, mutuality, self-discipline, and self-actualization of individuals. If a goal of education in schools is to realize democratic ideals, the underlying value of participation in decision making is in harmony with it. Etzioni (1964:38) noted "the virtues of democratic leadership which not only is highly communicative and encourages participation but also is just, non-arbitrary and concerned with the problems of workers, not just those of work." Dykes (1964:155) stated that

> To assume that our schools can contribute to the strength and vitality of democracy without themselves being examples of democracy in action is exceedingly naive. It is too much to expect teachers to instill in the young appreciation and understanding of the democratic way when they themselves are denied a voice in decisions of vital importance to them. The delicate and difficult task of developing faith and confidence in democracy as a social system cannot be accomplished in a setting which is itself barren of democratic processes.

The tasks of an organization can be effectively carried out with the active participation of subordinates. Participative decision making can contribute to increasing goal identification and responsibility which are related to active involvement of subordinates in their work. Schuttenberg, McArdle and Thomas (1979:275) contended that "if staff members are not meaningfully involved in making decisions that affect them and for which they have expertise, they will withhold their organizational commitment over time."

Appropriate decisions are hard to make by superordinates alone, especially in the area of professional work because they have limited knowledge, experience, information, and skills. In order to make effective decisions, relevant personnel should be involved. Simpkins and Friesen (1969) stated two reasons why teachers should participate in decision making regarding their work in the school. The reasons include (1) the increasing professionalism of teachers and (2) effective decision making at the point closest to the need for the decision.

Rogers (1975:174) also asserted that

> maximum efficiency of decision making will occur when the decision is made at the point at which the necessary expertise, authority, and information intersect that is the closest to the point of origin of the need for the decision.

Participative decision making may also provide an opportunity to meet the self-actualization need of subordinates. Schein (1980:70) stated that

> the whole concept of "participative management," the idea that employees should be involved in those decisions which directly affect them, flows most clearly from the assumptions that employees want to be morally involved in their work organizations, want to influence decisions, and want to be able to use their capacities in the service of organizational goals.

Participative decision making should increase the job satisfaction of subordinates as well as meet the need to belong, which is closely associated with loyalty and commitment. According to Schein (1980:64),

> if employees can expect the gratification of some important emotional needs through participation in the organization, they can to a degree become more morally involved in the organization. Such involvement in turn permits the organization to legitimately expect loyalty, commitment, and greater identification with organizational goals.

The involvement of subordinates in the decision-making process can be justified in terms of the following: realizing democratic ideals, increasing organizational effectiveness, respecting the expertise and professionalism of personnel, making effective decisions, increasing organizational commitment, exercising legitimate authority, and meeting some psychological needs of subordinates.

Considerations for Participation

In spite of the strong support for subordinate participation, there are positive and negative aspects involved. Without appropriate consideration of the particular situation, participation may not be effective. Mulder (1971:36) contended that inappropriate participation was worse than no participation:

> People may be engaged to participate in matters which are either completely unimportant or above their level of expertness. Such participation can be regarded as a learning process for which people are not rewarded: when they realize that they are not, in fact, contributing anything, they will have learned not to engage themselves in any other, possibly productive and useful, participation activities.

Bumbarger (1973:65) addressed the appropriate involvement of subordinates as follows:

> Another common criticism concerns the effect of lack of involvement of operating level personnel in the decisions made. Involvement can be a complex problem with a whole host of definitions. Too much concern with involvement per se can lead to misdirected effort. The question to be resolved is, "How can meaningful involvement be fostered to achieve better decisions?" The goal is not the maximum involvement of the greatest number of people but the most appropriate involvement for the purpose intended.

According to Rogers (1975:187), the determination of who should participte in decision making depends upon the characteristics of decision problems. He (1975:187-188) presented four characteristics in addition to the dimensions of importance, comprehensiveness, and complexity. They are:

> (1) the initiative of subordinate groups in planning their job activities, (2) the information from which problems are formulated and the routes by which the information enters the organization, (3) the specialized training, experience or equipment used to obtain improved decisions . . . and (4) the kinds of people who will be called upon to implement decisions once they are made and their expectations regarding participation in making these decisions.

Hoy and Miskel (1978:228) presented some generalizations based upon a review of much of the research and literature concerning teacher participation in decision making: (1) participation is an important factor for the morale and enthusiasm of teachers; (2) participation is positively related to their professional satisfaction; (3) participation induces positive attitudes of teachers toward their principal; (4) too much involvement produces negative results; (5) there is a need for diverse roles and functions of both teachers and administrators according to the nature of the problem; (6) environmental factors affect the degree of teacher participation.

Generally speaking, participative decision making seems to be advantageous with appropriate involvement of subordinates. The involvement of subordinates needs to be determined according to various factors such as the nature of problems, characteristics of subordinates, and the internal and external environment.

Research Related to Decision-Making Authority in Schools

Simpkins's Study

Simpkins (1968) explored teachers' perceptions of and preferences for the distribution of decision-making authority in fourteen schools of the Edmonton Public School District. The study focussed on the distribution of decison-making authority between the individual teacher, the formal staff group, and the higher official authority regarding policies and procedures of twelve tasks in four areas: (1) curriculum planning and adaptation, (2) classroom management, (3) arrangement of instructional program, and (4) general school organization.

Teacher perceptions. Teachers perceived that the individual teacher played the primary decision-making role in the area of classroom management, whereas the higher official authority played the dominant role in decisions regarding tasks external to classroom management. The formal staff group exercised minor decision-making authority for all twelve task activities. The schools studied showed some of the characteristics of semi-professional organizations.

The perceived distribution of decision-making authority was generally similar in elementary, junior high, and senior high schools. However, teachers in the junior high school were perceived to be more involved in determining action than those in the elementary and senior high schools.

Teacher preferences. Teachers preferred to have the individual teacher exercise the primary decision-making authority for tasks in the area of classroom management. In this area, preferences were similar to perceptions.

Teachers preferred the individual teacher to have the primary role in deciding tasks as follows: (1) tasks in the area of classroom management; (2) determining the detailed content of a curriculum; and (3) determining arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling.

Teachers preferred the formal staff group to have the primary decision-making authority regarding the following tasks: (1) determining school rules and regulations for the general student body; (2) determining the teaching load and other duties of teachers; and (3) determining the allocation of money to the teachers or departments for instructional aids and equipment.

In most tasks external to classroom management, teachers preferred to have the individual teacher and/or the staff group exercise substantial decision-making authority. However, teachers preferred to see the higher official authority have the primary authority in deciding the basic outline of the curriculum.

There was little evidence for variation in determining actions for task activities in the preferences of teachers grouped according to sex and length of experience.

There were some variations in the preferences of teachers classified according to elementary, junior high, and senior high schools. That is, teachers in senior high schools preferred that the individual teacher have a higher degree of decision-making authority in the area of classroom management, while they preferred a greater degree of the higher official authority to exercise the primary authority in tasks external to classroom management, as compared with teachers in the elementary schools. The full-fledged professional ideology was not perfectly reflected in teacher preferences.

In summary, teachers desired a considerable change in the use of administrative authority and professional authority regarding important tasks.

Other Studies

Chamberlain (1975) examined the opinions of Oregon public school teachers and principals regarding the degree of teacher participation in decision making for four areas: (1) curriculum and instruction, (2) staff personnel, (3) student personnel, and (4) school-community relations. The sample comprised 237 teachers and 143 principals in the State of Oregon. He found that (1) teachers felt a larger discrepancy between perceptions and preferences than principals, (2) teachers were not and did not want to be involved in the same way in all decisions, (3) and teachers expected to be involved to a higher degree in Curriculum and

Instruction and Student Personnel decisions. The results also suggested that the demographic variables such as school level, sex, years of teaching experience had little effect on the valuations of teachers and principals. However, both elementary school teachers and principals desired more teacher participation in Student Personnel decisions than secondary school teachers.

Isherwood and Taylor (1978) sought to identify decision issues to be dealt with by school councils with a sample of forty-two schools in Quebec. The responses of principals and teachers were markedly different. Principals wanted the school council to have more say over instructional matters, but teachers wanted to have more power over managerial matters. Isherwood and Taylor (p. 268) stated that

> Generally, the principals thought the council should have more say over teaching methods, homework assignment, the organization of extra-curricular activites. . . . Evidently, teachers thought these items were within their domain and they were not ready to relinquish their autonomy to a school council. In contrast, council members and teachers thought the council should have more decisional authority over teacher promotion and fiscal matters in the school than did the principals.

Alutto and Belasco (1972) reported a study on teacher participation in decision making with a sample of over 400 teachers in western New York State. The study identified the three features--deprivation, equilibrium, and saturation--which teachers experienced concerning their involvement in decision making. Teachers with a higher level of decisional deprivation showed a lower level of satisfaction. "Decision-deprived" teachers also showed negative attitudes. However, it was suggested that the universal desirability of increased participation in decision making should be modified with consideration of differential participation in decision making.

Similarly, Conway (1976) studied the relationship between levels of teacher participation and their satisfaction with their schools with a sample of 166 teachers in western New York State. Both overparticipation and decisional deprivation increased teacher dissatisfaction. However, a very large proportion of teachers aspired to more involvement in decision making. Conway (p.139) suggested that "administrators must match the desire for participation of individuals with the opportunities to realize those desires."

Participation in different decision domains in relation to teacher satisfaction was investigated by Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman (1978) with a sample of teachers in twenty-two schools in the Midwest in the United States. They found that while participation in technical domain decisions was related to teachers' job satisfaction, participation in managerial domain decisions did not have a significant relationship to their satisfaction. However, teachers desired more participation in managerial domain decisions. Mohrman et al (p. 26) asserted that "the effectiveness of participative leadership is contingent on situational variables, including the nature of the problem or task."

Masse (1969) investigated teacher participation and professional attitudes with a sample of teachers in Quebec. He found that authority structure was in conflict with the aspiration of teachers for greater decison-making authority in the professional area. A positive relationship was also identified between the desire for increased decision-making authority and the teachers' professional orientation.

Regarding bureaucratically-structured organizations in relation to professionals' alienation, Cox and Wood (1980) surveyed 279 teachers in a U.S. mid-western city. They found that participation in decision making was negatively related to teacher alienation, while hierarchy of authority was positively related to teacher alienation. Cox and Wood (p. 6) concluded that

> Numerous sociologists observe the conflict experienced by professional employees in bureaucratically structured organizations. The basic problem is location of authority. . . . Increasing alienation among teachers may result from greater professionalization of teaching and the concomitant rigidity of organizational structure of most school systems.

Hoy and Sousa (1984) examined the relationships between delegated decision making and three concepts: (1) hierarchy of authority perceived by teachers, (2) the job satisfaction of teachers, and (3) teacher loyalty to the principals with a sample of 55 public senior high schools in New Jersey. Hoy and Sausa (pp. 327-328) summarized their findings in this way:

> The willingness of principals to delegate important decisions to teachers . . . can result in potential benefits for the school organization. First, teachers are less likely to perceive a strong authority structure and thus may be more apt to identify with the goals and objectives of the school. Second, teachers gain a greater sense of job satisfaction, which tends to produce improved attitudes toward their work and the people with whom they work. Third, teachers are more inclined to exhibit loyalty to their principals.

The studies cited above indicate that teacher participation in decision making is positively related to job satisfaction and loyalty to the principal. On the other hand, hierarchy of authority is positively associated with teacher alienation. Most studies agreed that teachers generally desired more involvement in decision making, depending on the nature of the tasks.

Summary

This chapter dealt with the concept of authority and authority structures in formal organizations. Three perspectives were presented: (1) the bureaucratic model, (2) the human relations model, and (3) the professional model. Authority structures in schools were also reviewed. Second, the nature of decision making and participation in decision making was discussed. Finally, related studies were summarized.

Authority is regarded as the legitimate and normative power to make decisions which control the behavior of others toward accomplishing organizational goals. The distribution of authority in formal organizations is basically hierarchical, but the dynamics of authority cannot be viewed solely from the hierarchy.

Authority structures in organizations employing professionals are characterized by the mixture of two basic types of authority: (1) administrative authority based on a hierarchy and (2) professional authority derived from knowledge and expertise. Administrative authority is exercised by rank, while professional authority is exercised by individual professionals or groups of professionals. Authority structures vary depending upon the degree of professionalization of members. In full-fledged professional organizations, professionals have substantial authority in defining and implementing goals. In semi-professional organizations, professionals have considerable authority over task decisions regarding means or techniques. Thus, professional authority is based on the degree of expertise and ability of professionals to control the conditions of their work and to gain autonomy from administrative authority.

School organizations are characterized by a combination of properties of both bureaucratic and human relations models. The distribution of authority is generally characterized by the relative degree of administrative authority and professional authority regarding task activities. Also, highly bureaucratic authority seems to be ineffective in accomplishing educational goals. Therefore, a balance between administrative and professional authority must be maintained in order to meet the needs of the organization and the needs of individuals.

Decision making is a rational process of choice or judgment. Participative decision making is considered to be one attempt to decentralize authority throughout an organization. Organizations function more effectively when decisions are made with the active participation of personnel close to the point of implementation.

Numerous studies indicated that participation in decision making is positively related to job satisfaction. Most studies indicated that teachers generally desire more involvement in decision making, but this depends on the nature of the tasks.

The review indicated that the distribution of the decision-making authority in schools can be examined by the relative degree of involvement at three levels--the individual teacher, the staff group, and administrators--in determining action for important tasks.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses the content, validity and reliability of the instrument used in this study. The sample of the study, the procedures of data collection, and data treatment are also described.

Instrument

In order to examine the research questions posed in Chapter 1, the researcher modified and augmented the questionnaire developed by Simpkins (1968).

The original instrument was developed under the following guidelines by Simpkins (1968:63-66):

1. The distinction between the three decision-making units: the individual teacher, the formal staff group, and the higher official authority.
2. The distinction between tasks classified under the following four general task areas:

   Curriculum Planning and Adaptation

   (1) Determination of the basic outline of a curriculum.

   (2) Determination of the detailed content of a curriculum.

   (3) Determination of the texts and instructional material for a curriculum.

Classroom Management

(4)Determination of the way a subject matter field is presented in classes.

(5) Determination of the frequency and methods of classroom testing.

(6) Determination of the relative friendliness of classroom teacher-pupil relationships.

Arrangement of School Instructional Program

(7) Determination of the size and composition of class.

(8) Determination of the promotion and class placement of pupils.

(9) Determination of the allocation of money to teachers or departments for instructional aids and equipment.

General School Organization

(10) Determination of the teaching load and other duties of teachers.

(11) Determination of arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling.

(12) Determination of school rules and regulations for the general student body.

3. The distinction between decisions on policy and principles, and decisions on specifc procedure and practice.
4. The distinction between degrees of probability of a decision-making unit in determining action regarding

each task. The degree was measured by using the five-point Likert type scale ranged from 1 to 5:
1 (extremely low probability of occurrence),
2 (moderately low probability of occurrence),
3 (impossible to judge probability of occurrence),
4 (moderately high probability of occurrence), and
5 (extremely high probability of occurrence).

Validity of the Instrument

The instrument is designed to deal more with the operation of the school instructional program, as compared with other instruments used for the studies on decision making by Sharma (1955), Alutto and Belasco (1972), Chamberlain (1975), Conway (1976), and Isherwood and Taylor (1978). Since the major tasks of schools have not changed, the instrument developed by Simpkins was considered to be appropriate for this study. However, an attempt was made to improve the validity of the instrument by modifying the questionnaire. In order to improve the validity of the questionnaire, the questionnaire must be oriented toward the whole research problem and each item of the questionnaire must be relevant to the problem, as well as being clear and unambiguous to the respondent. Mouly (1978:194) discussed the validation of questionnaires:

> It must first be recognized that, although it is oriented toward the whole problem, the questionnaire is comprised of relatively independent questions, each dealing with a specific aspect of the overall situation. In a sense, then, it is the validity of the individual items as well as that of the total instrument that is under consideration. . . . On the other hand, that the validity of the individual items must be considered does not negate the fact that the questionnaire must have a unity and validity of its own with respect to the problem under investigation.

Mouly (1978:195) addressed two critical points: (1) "Does the questionnaire have sufficient appeal that a high percentage of returns can be expected?" (2) "Does the questionnaire relate to the problem; is it free of leading questions, ambiguous or irrelevant items?" Basically, the questionnaire was modified in the light of the two questions.

Modifications and additions to the questionnaire were made on the basis of a review of relevant studies and of advice received from the supervisory committee and colleagues, as well as from a pilot study conducted using nine teachers. The final version of the questionnaire was modified as follows:

1. The five-point Likert type scale ranged from 1 to 5: 1 (very low involvement), 2 (low involvement), 3 (moderate involvement), 4 (high involvement), 5 (very high involvement).
2. The distinction between decisions on policy and principles, and decisions on specific procedures and

practice was ambiguous so that the distinction was not included in the modified questionnaire.

3. In order to decrease the length of time necessary for a response, the degree of the perceived and the preferred involvement of each decision-making unit regarding each task was to be indicated by the respondent simultaneously.
4. The wording changes in the six items of the questionnaire were made as follows:

   Item 1. Determination of the school's total program.

   Item 2. Determination of the detailed content of the school's program.

   Item 3. Determination of the texts and instructional material for various subjects.

   Item 4. Determination of the way a subject is presented in class.

   Item 8. Determination of the grading and promotion of students.

   Item 9. Determination of the allocation of money to individuals and groups of teachers for instructional aids and equipment.
5. In addition to the twelve tasks in the four general task areas in the original questionnaire, the following three tasks were added with a consideration of the importance of professional development activities, teacher evaluation, and school budgets for the operation of the

school program:

Item 13. Determination of the nature of organized professional activities.

Item 14. Determination of how teachers are to be evaluated.

Item 15. Determination of the expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.

6. In order to solicit a free response from the respondent with respect to sharing responsibilities for decision making in education, **Part D** was added.
7. In order to measure the overall satisfaction level of the respondent, **Part E** was added.

The modified questionnaire consisted of the Personal Information Section and five parts. (A copy of the questionnaire is provided in Appendix A.)

The Personal Information Section was used to identify the respondent's type of school, sex, years of teaching experience, and years of training the respondent is credited with for salary purposes.

Part A was designed to measure the perceived and the preferred involvement of the individual teacher in determining action for each of the fiften tasks by using a five-point scale: 1 (very low involvement), 2 (low involvement), 3 (moderate involvement), 4 (high involvement), 5 (very high involvement).

Part B was designed to measure the perceived and the preferred involvement of the formal staff group in determining action for each of the fifteen tasks by using a five-point scale.

Part C was designed to measure the perceived and the preferred involvement of the higher official authority in determining action for each of the fifteen tasks by using a five-point scale.

Part D was used to solicit a free response from respondents on the topic of sharing responsibilities for decision making in education.

Part E was designed to measure the overall satisfaction level of respondents in their involvement in school decision making by using a six-point scale: 1 (very dissatisfied), 2 (moderately dissatisfied), 3 (slightly dissatisfied), 4 (slightly satisfied), 5 (moderately satisfied), and 6 (very satisfied).

Reliability of the Instrument

Reliability can be defined as the consistency of an instrument. A reliability test does not seem to be crucial in a heterogeneous type of questionnaire. Mouly (1978:195) indicated that "split-half reliability, for example, is out of the question because of the relative independence and nonadditivity of the component items." He (1978:196) further said that:

> Actually, establishing reliability may not be that crucial, if we assume that we are indeed dealing with random error. The reliability of group averages with which we are concerned is invariably greater than that of the individual response and, if *n* is large, questionnaire reliability should be adequate for the purpose of most studies. Ensuring validity might be a better investment of one's time and energy.

However, in Simpkins's study, a reliability test of the instrument was undertaken after the instrument was applied to the test group. Simpkins used an AhmaVaara Factor Match for the reliability test of the instrument (1968:118-120). The result indicated that the instrument was acceptable for the study.

Sample

Fifteen schools in the Edmonton Public School District were recommended as the sample for the study by Dr.Blowers of the School District. The sample schools met the following conditions: (1) schools with a minimum of fifteen regular classroom teachers, and (2) schools which organized instruction on the basis of the self-contained classroom. As seen in Table 3.1, the total number of the sample included 580 teachers from the fifteen schools, comprising 108 teachers in the five elementary schools, 156 teachers in the five junior high schools, and 316 teachers in the five senior high schools.

TABLE 3.1

Returns of Questionnaire from Participating Schools and Teachers

Sample	Returns	Number	%
Elementary 5 schools (N=108)	Accepted for analyses	66	61.1
	Not accepted for analyses	1	0.9
	Total	67	62.0
Junior High 5 schools (N=156)	Accepted for analyses	83	53.2
	Not accepted for analyses	2	1.3
	Total	85	54.5
Senior High 5 schools (N=316)	Accepted for analyses	149	47.1
	Not accepted for analyses	7	2.2
	Total	156	49.3
Total 15 schools (N=580)	Accepted for analyses	298	51.3
	Not accepted for analyses	10	1.7
	Total	308	53.0

TABLE 3.2

Description of Sample

Category	Elem Number	%	JHS Number	%	SHS Number	%	Total Number
Sex							
Male	17	25.8	52	62.7	87	58.4	156
Female	49	74.2	31	37.3	62	41.6	142
Total	66	100.0	83	100.0	149	100.0	298
Years of teaching experience							
1	0	0.0	2	2.4	1	0.7	3
2-5	9	13.6	13	15.7	16	10.7	38
6-10	16	24.2	18	21.7	32	21.5	66
11-20	36	54.5	30	36.1	69	46.3	135
21 or more	5	7.6	20	24.1	31	20.8	56
Total	66	99.9	83	100.0	149	100.0	298
Years of training							
Less than 4	1	1.5	0	0.0	2	1.3	3
4	42	63.6	33	39.8	44	29.5	119
5	13	19.7	31	37.3	56	37.6	100
6 or more	10	15.2	19	22.9	47	31.5	76
Total	66	100.0	83	100.0	149	99.9	298

Data Collection

Procedures

The study was approved by the Edmonton Public School District on September 14, 1984 (see Appendix B). The researcher also obtained approval from the principals of the recommended schools (see Appendix B). Questionnaires were sent to the principals of the schools for distribution to the 580 teachers on November 12, 1984 (see Appendix B). A return envelope was provided for each teacher. A follow-up letter (see Appendix B) was mailed to all principals, thanking them for their assistance and reminding those who had not returned the questionnaire to do so as soon as possible.

Returns of the Questionnaire

The distribution of returns of the questionnaire from participating schools and teachers was summarized in Table 3.1. The total number of returns was 308 (53.0%), of which 298 (51.3%) were accepted for analyses. Specifically, questionnaires accepted for analyses were as follows: 66 (61.1%) for the elementary schools, 83 (53.2%) for the junior high schools, and 149 (47.1%) for the senior high schools. Table 3.2 shows the description of the sample by type of school, sex, years of teaching experience, and years of training of the teachers.

Analysis of Data

Data analyses were carried out by six categories in order to examine: (1) the perceived and preferred distribution of decision-making authority regarding the fifteen tasks, (2) degree of discrepancy between the perceived and the preferred involvement of each of the three decision-making units regarding each of the fifteen tasks, (3) differences in degrees of the involvement and discrepancy by demographic variables, (4) overall satisfaction level of teachers with their involvement in decision making, (5) the relationship between overall satisfaction of teachers and decisional deprivation of teachers for each task, (6) major sources of overall dissatisfaction of teachers with their involvement in decision making.

Distribution of Decision-Making Authority

The distribution was determined by the relative degree of the involvement of the three decision-making units for each of the fifteen tasks. In order to determine the distribution, the mean involvement score of each decision-making unit in determining action for each task was calculated for each teacher group categorized by type of school. The mean involvement score represents the degree of involvement. The relative degree was determined by significant differences in the mean scores of the three decision-making units for each task.

Discrepancy between the Perceived and Preferred Involvement

The mean perceived and preferred involvement scores of each decision-making unit regarding each task were computed for each teacher group categorized by type of school. Second, the discrepancy score was calculated by subtracting the mean preferred involvement score from the mean perceived score for each task. The discrepancy score represents the degree of discrepancy. Third, the rank order for the degree of discrepancy for each task was determined by the size of discrepancy score in the fifteen tasks.

Differences by Demographic variables

The *t* test of uncorrelated means was used to test for significance of differences in mean scores between male and female. On the other hand, the one-way analysis of variance, ANOVA, was used to test for significance of differences among mean scores of teacher groups categorized by type of school, length of teaching experience, and length of training.

Overall Satisfaction Level of Teachers

The mean score of teacher satisfaction with their involvement in decision making was calculated. The mean score represents overall satisfaction level of teachers with their decision-making involvement.

Relationship btween Overall Satisfaction of Teachers and Decisional Deprivation of Teachers

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were used to determine the relationship between overall satisfaction of teachers with their involvement in decision making and decisional deprivation of teachers for each task.

Major Sources of Overall Dissatisfaction of Teachers

Multiple regression analysis was conducted with satisfaction with decision making as criterion and decisional deprivation scores as predictors.

Summary

In this chapter, the research methodology was described. Emphasis was placed on the modification and validation of an instrument as well as the nature of the sample, and methods of data analysis.

The modified questionnaire consisted of the personal information section and five parts: (1) three parts designed to measure the perceived and preferred degree of involvement of the three decision-making units by using a five-point scale, (2) the fourth part designed to obtain free expressions of opinion from respondents on participation in decision making, and (3) the final part designed to measure the degree of overall satisfaction level of teachers with their involvement in decision making.

The data of the study were collected by using the questionnaire. The questionnaire was sent to 580 teachers in fifteen schools. The total number of returns was 308 (53.0%), from which 298 (51.3%) were accepted for analysis.

Analysis of the data relied mostly on descriptive statistics, tests of significance, and correlational analysis.

CHAPTER 4

PERCEIVED DISTRIBUTION OF DECISION-MAKING AUTHORITY

This chapter presents findings on the distribution of decision-making authority as perceived by teachers in the elementary, junior high, and senior high schools. The distribution was determined by the relative degree of perceived involvement of the three decision-making units--the individual teacher, the formal staff group, and the higher official authority--in each of the fifteen tasks. In addition, analyses were conducted to determine whether there were any significant differences regarding decision-making involvement in the perceptions of teachers categorized by type of school, sex, length of teaching experience, and length of training of the teachers.

Perceived Involvement in Decision Making

Research Question 1.1: What is the distribution of decision-making authority perceived by teachers in the elementary, junior high, and senior high schools?

In order to examine the question, the perceived mean involvement score of each decision-making unit in determining action for each task was calculated for each respondent group classified by type of school. The mean involvement score represents the degree of involvement. The relative degree was determined on the basis of significant differences in the mean involvement scores of the three decision-making units with respect to each of the fifteen tasks. The *t* test of significance for correlated means was used to test the differences between mean scores.

Elementary School Level

As seen in Table 4.1, the mean involvement scores of the individual teacher at the elementary school were significantly higher than those of the formal staff group and the higher official authority in determining action for all three tasks (Tasks 4, 5, and 6) in the area of classroom management. In contrast, the mean involvement scores of the higher official authority were significantly higher than those of the two other decision-making units in determining action for six tasks outside classroom management: Task 1 (the school's total program), Task 7 (the size and composition of classes), Task 9 (the allocation of money to individuals and groups of teachers for instructional aids and equipment), Task 10 (teaching load and other duties of teachers), Task 14 (how teachers are to be evaluated), and Task 15 (the expenditure patterns of school-based budgets). For Tasks 2 and 3 in the area of the school's program planning and adaptation, and Task 12 on school rules and regulations for the general student body, the mean involvement scores of the three decision-making units were not significantly different. For Task 8 (grading and promotion of students), the mean involvement scores of the

TABLE 4.1

Mean Involvement Scores of Three Decision-Making Units in Determining Action for Each Task as Perceived by Elementary School Teachers
(N=66)

Tasks	D-M Units* 1	2	3	Diff**
Determination of				
1. School's total program.	2.64	3.09	4.05	1-2, 1-3 2-3
2. Detailed content of the school's program.	2.92	3.00	3.22	none
3. Texts and instructional material for subjects.	3.31	3.23	3.39	none
4. The way a subject is presented in class.	4.62	2.78	1.86	1-2, 1-3 2-3
5. Frequency and methods of classroom testing.	3.67	2.58	2.74	1-2, 1-3
6. Friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	4.57	2.94	2.41	1-2, 1-3
7. Size and composition of classes.	2.30	2.54	4.47	1-3, 2-3
8. Grading and promotion of students.	3.67	2.79	3.42	1-2, 2-3
9. Allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	2.70	2.92	4.09	1-3, 2-3
10. Teaching load and other duties of teachers.	2.58	2.41	4.29	1-3, 2-3
11. Arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling.	3.59	3.00	3.42	1-2
12. School rules/regulations for general student body.	3.32	3.51	3.72	none
13. Nature of organized professional development activities.	3.11	3.45	3.74	1-2, 1-3
14. How teachers are to be evaluated.	2.48	2.60	3.97	1-3, 2-3
15. Expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	2.70	2.83	4.41	1-3, 2-3

*1=Individual Teacher, 2=Staff Group, 3=Higher Authority.
**Significant beyond the .01 level.

individual teacher and the higher official authority did not significantly differ from each other but both of them were significantly higher than the mean score of the formal staff group. Another feature of the data indicated the significantly higher involvement of both the formal staff group and the higher official authority in resolving matters on the nature of organized professional development activities.

Junior High School Level

At the junior high school, as shown in Table 4.2, the involvement patterns of the three decision-making units were generally similar to those of the elementary school in determining action for the fifteen tasks. The mean involvement scores of the individual teacher were significantly higher than those of the formal staff group and the higher official authority in deciding matters on the three tasks in the area of classroom management. In contrast, the mean involvement scores of the higher official authority were significantly higher than those of the individual teacher and the formal staff group regarding seven tasks external to classroom management: Task 1 (the school's total program), Task 7 (the size and composition of classes), Task 9 (the allocation of money to individuals and groups of teachers for instructional aids and equipment), Task 10 (the teaching load and other duties of teachers), Task 12 (school rules and regulations for the general

TABLE 4.2

Mean Involvement Scores of Three Decision-Making Units
in Determining Action for Each Task as Perceived
by Junior High School Teachers
(N=83)

Tasks	D-M Units* 1	2	3	Diff**
Determination of				
1. School's total program.	2.27	2.73	3.88	1-2, 1-3 2-3
2. Detailed content of the school's program.	2.58	2.84	3.11	none
3. Texts and instructional material for subjects.	3.00	2.91	2.91	none
4. The way a subject is presented in class.	4.30	2.76	1.90	1-2, 1-3 2-3
5. Frequency and methods of classroom testing.	4.25	3.29	2.06	1-2, 1-3 2-3
6. Friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	4.29	2.61	1.93	1-2, 1-3 2-3
7. Size and composition of classes.	1.74	2.10	4.09	1-2, 1-3 2-3
8. Grading and promotion of students.	3.45	3.10	3.22	1-2
9. Allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	2.51	2.67	4.07	1-3, 2-3
10. Teaching load and other duties of teachers.	2.20	2.04	4.24	1-3, 2-3
11. Arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling.	3.20	2.72	3.21	1-2
12. School rules/regulations for general student body.	2.94	3.10	3.71	1-3, 2-3
13. Nature of organized professional development activities.	3.23	3.30	3.50	none
14. How teachers are to be evaluated.	2.41	2.49	3.96	1-3, 2-3
15. Expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	2.42	2.63	4.15	1-3, 2-3

*1=Individual Teacher, 2=Staff Group, 3=Higher Authority.
**Significant beyond the .01 level.

student body), Task 14 (how teachers are to be evaluated), and Task 15 (the expenditure patterns of school-based budgets). For Tasks 2 and 3 in the area of school's program planning and adaptation, and Task 13 on professional development activities, the mean involvement scores of the three decision-making units were not significantly different. For Task 8 (the grading and promotion of students) and Task 11 (arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling), there was a tendency for the individual teacher to be involved more in comparison with the two other decision-making units.

Senior High School Level

At the senior high school, as indicated in Table 4.3, the involvement of the three decision-making units was similar to that of the elementary and junior high schools in resolving matters on a majority of the tasks. The mean involvement scores of the individual teacher were significantly higher than those of the formal staff group and the higher official authority with respect to the three tasks concerning classroom management, along with Task 8 (the grading and promotion of students). In contrast, the mean involvement scores of the higher official authority were significantly higher than those of the individual teacher and the formal staff group regarding all tasks external to classroom management except for Tasks 3, 8, 11, and 13. For Task 3 (the texts and instructional materials

TABLE 4.3

Mean Involvement Scores of Three Decision-Making Units in Determining Action for Each Task as Perceived by Senior High School Teachers
(N=149)

Tasks	D-M Units* 1	2	3	Diff**
Determination of				
1. School's total program.	2.13	2.76	4.23	1-2, 1-3 2-3
2. Detailed content of the school's program.	2.46	2.71	3.50	1-3, 2-3
3. Texts and instructional material for subjects.	3.04	2.95	3.06	none
4. The way a subject is presented in class.	4.54	2.61	1.83	1-2, 1-3 2-3
5. Frequency and methods of classroom testing.	4.23	2.92	2.17	1-2, 1-3 2-3
6. Friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	4.47	2.43	1.96	1-2, 1-3 2-3
7. Size and composition of classes.	1.78	2.13	4.35	1-2, 1-3 2-3
8. Grading and promotion of students.	3.91	3.03	2.91	1-2, 1-3
9. Allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	2.35	2.87	4.08	1-2, 1-3 2-3
10. Teaching load and other duties of teachers.	2.05	2.34	4.31	1-2, 1-3 2-3
11. Arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling.	3.15	2.76	3.49	1-2, 2-3
12. School rules/regulations for general student body.	2.56	3.03	4.03	1-2, 1-3 2-3
13. Nature of organized professional development activities.	3.29	3.57	3.25	1-2, 2-3
14. How teachers are to be evaluated.	2.42	2.82	4.10	1-2, 1-3 2-3
15. Expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	2.30	2.88	4.21	1-2, 1-3 2-3

*1=Individual Teacher, 2=Staff Group, 3=Higher Authority.
**Significant beyond the .01 level.

for various subjects), the mean involvement scores of the three decision-making units were not significantly different. For Task 11 (arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling), the mean involvement scores of both the individual teacher and the higher official authority were significantly higher than the mean score of the formal staff group. Another notable feature of the data was the higher involvement level of the formal staff group in determining the nature of the organized professional development activities.

Summary

First, the individual teacher was seen by teachers at all three levels to have a major role in resolving matters on all tasks in the area of classroom management, while the higher official authority was perceived to have a major role in determining action for a majority of tasks external to classroom management, particularly for tasks concerning (1) the total school's program, (2) resource allocation, (3) teaching load and other duties of teachers, (4) class size and composition, and (5) teacher evaluation.

Second, for some tasks such as (1) selection of texts and instructional material, (2) grading and promotion of students, and (3) arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling, there was a tendency for the individual teacher to be more involved in determining action, compared with other tasks outside classroom management.

Finally, the formal staff group was perceived to have a leading role in determining action for only one task concerning the nature of organized professional development activities.

Differences in Involvement in Decision Making by Type of School

Research Question 1.2: What significant differences exist in the involvement of each decision-making unit in determining action for each of the fifteen tasks in the perceptions of teachers categorized by type of school?

In order to examine the question, the mean perceived involvement score of each decision-making unit with respect to each task was calculated for each group of teachers classified by type of school. The one-way analysis of variance, ANOVA, was used to test for significant differences among the mean scores of the teacher groups with respect to each task. The Scheffe test was used to determine the location and direction of the differences among mean scores. The significant level for the Scheffe was set at .10.

The Individual Teacher as Decision-Making Unit

As seen in Table 4.4, the mean involvement scores of the individual teacher were significantly higher at the elementary school than at the junior high school or/and the senior high school, regarding six tasks outside classroom management: two tasks in the area of the school's program

TABLE 4.4

Mean Perceived Involvement Scores of the Individual
Teacher in Determining Action for Each Task
by Type of School
(N=298)

	Type of School				
Tasks	**1.Elem** n=66	**2.JHS** n=83	**3.SHS** n=149	**F**	**Diff**
Determination of					
1. School's total program.	2.65	2.26	2.12	7.05**	1-2 1-3
2. Detailed content of the school's program.	2.92	2.57	2.45	4.39*	1-3
3. Texts and instructional material for subjects.	3.34	2.99	3.01	1.85	
4. The way a subject is presented in class.	4.62	4.31	4.53	2.94	
5. Frequency and methods of classroom testing.	3.67	4.26	4.23	8.40**	1-2 1-3
6. Friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	4.55	4.30	4.47	1.89	
7. Size and composition of classes.	2.28	1.73	1.77	8.63**	1-2 1-3
8. Grading and promotion of students.	3.63	3.46	3.92	5.64**	2-3
9. Allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	2.71	2.51	2.36	2.65	
10. Teaching load and other duties of teachers.	2.59	2.20	2.04	7.30**	1-2 1-3
11. Arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling.	3.61	3.20	3.15	3.86*	1-3
12. School rules/regulations for general student body.	3.32	2.95	2.57	12.22**	1-3 2-3
13. Nature of organized professional development activities.	3.09	3.24	3.28	0.71	
14. How teachers are to be evaluated.	2.55	2.41	2.42	0.35	
15. Expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	2.76	2.42	2.30	4.55*	1-3

$^{*}p<.05$, $^{**}p<.01$

planning and adaptation, one task concerning class size and composition, two tasks in the area of general school organization, and one task on the school-based budgets. In addition, the mean involvement score of the individual teacher was significantly higher at the elementary and junior high schools than at the senior high school for Task 12 (school rules and regulations for the general student body). On the other hand, for Task 8 (the grading and promotion of students), the mean involvement score of the individual teacher was significantly higher at the senior high school than at the elementary and junior high schools. Another aspect of the data indicated that the mean involvement score of the individual teacher at the elementary school was significantly lower than at the junior and senior high schools for Task 5 (frequency and methods of classroom testing).

The Formal Staff Group as Decision-Making Unit

As indicated in Table 4.5, there were no significant differences in the mean involvement scores of the formal staff group in determining action for a great majority of tasks in the perceptions of the three teacher groups. However, the mean involvement scores of the formal staff group at the elementary school were significantly higher than at the junior and senior high schools in determining action for Task 7 (the size and composition of classes) and Task 12 (school rules and regulations for the general

TABLE 4.5

Mean Perceived Involvement Scores of the Formal Staff
Group in Determining Action for Each Task
by Type of School
(N=298)

Tasks	Type of School 1.Elem n=66	 2.JHS n=83	 3.SHS n=149	F	Diff
Determination of					
1. School's total program.	3.09	2.73	2.76	2.83	
2. Detailed content of the school's program.	3.00	2.84	2.71	1.94	
3. Texts and instructional material for subjects.	3.22	2.91	2.95	1.53	
4. The way a subject is presented in class.	2.78	2.78	2.62	0.52	
5. Frequency and methods of classroom testing.	2.58	3.29	2.92	5.91**	1-2 2-3
6. Friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	2.95	2.61	2.43	2.96	
7. Size and composition of classes.	2.52	2.11	2.13	3.96*	1-2 1-3
8. Grading and promotion of students.	2.76	3.10	3.04	1.67	
9. Allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	2.92	2.66	2.87	1.51	
10. Teaching load and other duties of teachers.	2.41	2.04	2.34	3.32*	1-2 2-3
11. Arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling.	3.00	2.70	2.76	1.40	
12. School rules/regulations for general student body.	3.51	3.10	3.03	5.18**	1-2 1-3
13. Nature of organized professional development activities.	3.45	3.30	3.57	1.83	
14. How teachers are to be evaluated.	2.60	2.48	2.82	2.34	
15. Expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	2.83	2.63	2.88	1.52	

*$p<.05$, **$P<.01$

student body). The mean involvement score of the formal staff group at the junior high school was significantly higher than at the elementary and senior high schools for task 5 (frequency and methods of classroom testing), but lower for Task 10 (the teaching load and other duties of teachers).

The Higher Official Authority as Decision-Making Unit

Table 4.6 shows that the mean involvement scores of the higher official authority were significantly higher at the elementary school than at the junior and senior high schools regarding Tasks 5 and 6 in the area of classroom management. For Task 8 (the grading and promotion of students) and Task 13 (the nature of organized professional development activities), the mean involvement scores of the higher official authority were also significantly higher at the elementary school than at the senior high schools. For Tasks 1 and 2 in the area of the school's program planning and adaptation, the higher official authority was involved to a significantly greater extent at the senior high school than at the junior high school.

Summary

The involvement level of the individual teacher at the elementary school was significantly higher than at the junior high school for four tasks and also significantly higher than at the senior high school for seven tasks

TABLE 4.6

Mean Perceived Involvement Scores of the Higher Official Authority in Determining Action for Each Task by Type of School
(N=298)

	Type of School				
Tasks	**1.Elem** n=66	**2.JHS** n=83	**3.SHS** n=149	**F**	**Diff**
Determination of					
1. School's total program.	4.05	3.88	4.23	3.72*	2-3
2. Detailed content of the school's program.	3.23	3.11	3.50	3.58*	2-3
3. Texts and instructional material for subjects.	3.42	2.91	3.06	2.77	
4. The way a subject is presented in class.	1.88	1.90	1.84	0.11	
5. Frequency and methods of classroom testing.	2.74	2.06	2.17	7.68**	1-2 1-3
6. Friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	2.44	1.93	1.95	4.56*	1-2 1-3
7. Size and composition of classes.	4.48	4.09	4.35	3.26*	1-2
8. Grading and promotion of students.	3.42	3.22	2.91	5.34**	1-3
9. Allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	4.09	4.09	4.08	0.00	
10. Teaching load and other duties of teachers.	4.29	4.24	4.31	0.11	
11. Arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling.	3.42	3.20	3.49	1.53	
12. School rules/regulations for general student body.	3.72	3.71	4.03	2.90	
13. Nature of organized professional development activities.	3.74	3.50	3.25	4.86**	1-3
14. How teachers are to be evaluated.	3.97	3.96	4.10	0.69	
15. Expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	4.41	4.15	4.21	1.43	

**p*<.05, ***p*<.01

external to classroom management. Nevertheless, for one task in the area of classroom management, the involvement level of the individual teacher at the elementary school was significantly lower than at the junior and senior high schools.

The involvement level of the formal staff group at the elementary school was significantly higher than at the junior and senior high schools for two tasks outside classroom management. At the junior high school, the involvement level of the formal staff group was significantly higher for one task concerning classroom testing, but lower for one task concerning teaching load and other duties of teachers, compared with the elementary and senior high schools.

The level of involvement of the higher official authority was significantly higher at the elementary school than at the junior and senior high schools with respect to two tasks in the area of classroom management. For two tasks outside classroom management (one task regarding the grading and promotion of students and the other task regarding the nature of organized professional development activities) the involvement level of the higher official authority was also significantly higher at the elementary school than at the senior high school. However, for two tasks in the area of the school's program planning and adaptation, the level of involvement of the higher official authority was significantly higher at the senior high school than at the junior high school.

Differences in Involvement in Decision Making by Demographic Variables

In this section, analyses were conducted to determine whether there were any significant differences in the involvement of each decision-making unit in determining action for each task in the perceptions of teachers categorized by demographic variables. For analyses, the mean involvement score of each decision-making unit regarding each task was calculated for each teacher group. The *t* test of uncorrelated means was used to test for significant differences between the mean scores of teachers classified by sex. The one-way analysis of variance, ANOVA, was used to test for significant differences among the mean scores of teachers classified by length of teaching experience and length of training.

Male and Female

Research Question 1.3: What significant differences exist in the involvement of each decision-making unit in determining action for each of the fifteen tasks in the perceptions of teachers categorized by sex?

As seen in Table 4.7, there were no significant differences in the mean involvement scores of each decision-making unit regarding all tasks except for a few in the perceptions of teachers classified by sex. The higher involvement level of the individual teacher was perceived by

TABLE 4.7

Mean Perceived Involvement Scores of Each Decision-Making Unit in Determining Action for Each Task by Sex
(N=298)

Task	Individual Teacher			Staff Group			Higher Authority		
No.	**M**	**F**	*t*	**M**	**F**	*t*	**M**	**F**	*t*
	n=156	n=142		n=156	n=142		n=156	n=142	
1.	2.20	2.36	-1.43	2.84	2.82	0.16	4.06	4.11	-0.45
2.	2.61	2.57	0.33	2.78	2.85	-0.57	3.27	3.38	-0.87
3.	2.93	3.23	-2.06*	2.81	3.20	-2.92**	3.03	3.16	-0.87
4.	4.36	4.63	-2.96**	2.70	2.68	0.08	1.96	1.75	1.74
5.	4.16	4.06	0.81	3.04	2.84	1.32	2.27	2.27	0.01
6.	4.27	4.61	-3.66**	2.56	2.62	-0.34	2.00	2.10	-0.73
7.	1.84	1.91	-0.59	2.21	2.22	-0.08	4.33	4.28	0.43
8.	3.71	3.74	-0.26	3.02	2.97	0.35	3.14	3.08	0.45
9.	2.37	2.60	-1.83	2.77	2.88	-0.95	4.06	4.10	-0.34
10.	2.12	2.31	-1.63	2.23	2.33	-0.90	4.26	4.30	-0.33
11.	3.19	3.35	-1.16	2.72	2.88	-1.22	3.36	3.42	-0.36
12.	2.79	2.91	-0.95	3.06	3.26	-1.71	3.83	3.93	-0.75
13.	3.24	3.23	0.09	3.41	3.54	-1.10	3.37	3.51	-1.09
14.	2.44	2.45	-0.09	2.63	2.75	-0.89	3.95	4.11	-1.38
15.	2.42	2.47	-0.43	2.75	2.85	-0.80	4.16	4.32	-1.47

M=Male, F=Female
*$p<.05$, **$p<.01$

female staff for Task 3 (the texts and instructional material for various subjects), Task 4 (the way a subject is presented in class), and Task 6 (the relative friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships). Female staff also perceived the higher involvement level of the formal staff group for Task 3.

Length of Teaching Experience

Research Question 1.4: What significant differences exist in the involvement of each decision-making unit in determining action for each of the fifteen tasks in the perceptions of teachers categorized by length of teaching experience?

As seen in Tables 4.8, 4.9, and 4.10, there were no significant differences in the mean involvement scores of each decision-making unit regarding all except for nine cases out of 135 cases in the perceptions of teacher groups classified by length of teaching experience. As indicated in Table 4.8, the higher involvement level of the individual teacher was seen by teachers with the longest teaching experience (11 years or more) for four tasks. They were Task 5 (frequency and methods of classroom testing), Task 7 (the size and composition of classes), Task 10 (the teaching load and other duties of teachers), and Task 15 (the expenditure patterns of school-based budgets). As seen in Table 4.9, no significant difference occurred among the three teacher groups regarding the involvement of the formal staff group. Table 4.10 shows that the higher level of involvement of the higher official authority was observed by

TABLE 4.8

Mean Perceived Involvement Scores of the Individual Teacher in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Teaching Experience (N=298)

Task No.	Length of Teaching Experience			F	Difference
	1. 5 years or less n=41	2. 6-10 years n=66	3. 11 years or more n=191		
1.	2.05	2.20	2.35	1.90	
2.	2.32	2.50	2.68	2.16	
3.	2.93	3.12	3.08	0.34	
4.	4.44	4.51	4.49	0.09	
5.	3.73	4.12	4.19	3.44*	1-3
6.	4.29	4.63	4.40	2.64	
7.	1.66	1.66	1.99	4.62*	2-3
8.	3.54	3.71	3.77	0.87	
9.	2.17	2.44	2.56	2.40	
10.	2.00	2.02	2.32	3.51*	2-3
11.	3.15	3.22	3.31	0.43	
12.	2.66	2.88	2.87	0.70	
13.	3.02	3.24	3.27	0.89	
14.	2.46	2.30	2.49	0.73	
15.	2.10	2.41	2.53	3.01*	1-3

*$p<.05$

TABLE 4.9

Mean Perceived Involvement Scores of the Staff
Group in Determining Action for Each Task
by Length of Teaching Experience
(N=298)

	Length of Teaching Experience				
Task No.	1. 5 years or less n=41	2. 6-10 years n=66	3. 11 years or more n=191	F	Difference
1.	2.56	2.75	2.92	2.28	
2.	2.60	2.77	2.87	1.32	
3.	3.00	3.03	2.98	0.04	
4.	2.90	2.46	2.72	1.41	
5.	2.95	2.64	3.05	2.47	
6.	2.90	2.37	2.60	1.68	
7.	2.03	2.02	2.32	3.06	
8.	3.03	2.70	3.09	2.60	
9.	2.78	2.71	2.87	0.63	
10.	2.15	2.13	2.35	1.61	
11.	2.83	2.58	2.86	1.45	
12.	3.10	3.14	3.17	0.10	
13.	3.28	3.52	3.50	0.85	
14.	2.78	2.60	2.69	0.27	
15.	2.53	2.66	2.90	2.77	

*$p<.05$

TABLE 4.10

Mean Perceived Involvement Scores of the Higher Authority in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Teaching Experience (N=298)

Task No.	Length of Teaching Experience 1. 5 years or less n=41	2. 6-10 years n=66	3. 11 years or more n=191	F	Difference
1.	4.15	4.05	4.08	0.15	
2.	3.59	3.42	3.23	2.06	
3.	3.05	3.23	3.05	0.47	
4.	1.93	1.66	1.92	1.59	
5.	2.43	2.06	2.31	1.57	
6.	2.25	1.83	2.08	1.78	
7.	4.48	4.23	4.29	0.81	
8.	3.40	3.00	3.09	1.72	
9.	4.55	4.03	3.99	4.91**	1-2, 1-3
10.	4.50	4.44	4.18	3.00	
11.	3.70	3.38	3.32	1.60	
12.	4.33	3.98	3.74	5.12**	1-3
13.	3.88	3.52	3.31	4.89**	1-3
14.	4.23	4.17	3.93	2.46	
15.	4.60	4.32	4.13	4.46*	1-3

*$p<.05$, **$p<.01$

teachers with the shortest teaching experience (5 years or less) for four tasks. They were Task 9 (the allocation of money to individuals and groups of teachers for instructional aids and equipment), Task 12 (school rules and regulations for the general student body), Task 13 (the nature of organized professional development activities), and Task 15 (the expenditure patterns of school-based budgets).

Length of Training

Research Question 1.5: What significant differences exist in the involvement of each decision-making unit in determining action for each of the fifteen tasks in the perceptions of teachers categorized by length of training?

As seen in Tables 4.11, 4.12, there were no significant differences in the mean involvement scores of both the individual teacher and the formal staff group with respect to all tasks in the perceptions of teachers classified by length of training. However, two exceptions occurred regarding the involvement of the higher official authority as indicated in Table 4.13. Teachers with the longest period of training (six years or more) perceived the higher involvement level of the higher official authority in resolving matters on the school's total program, and teachers with five years of training perceived the higher involvement level of the higher official authority in determining action concerning grading and promotion of students.

TABLE 4.11

Mean Perceived Involvement Scores of the Individual
Teacher in Determining Action for Each Task
by Length of Training
(N=295)

Task No.	Length of Training 1. Four years n=119	 2. Five years n=100	 3. Six years or more n=76	F	Difference
1.	2.27	2.35	2.17	0.72	
2.	2.52	2.79	2.43	2.73	
3.	3.14	2.99	3.04	0.38	
4.	4.38	4.55	4.61	2.11	
5.	3.99	4.20	4.24	1.73	
6.	4.41	4.44	4.50	0.30	
7.	1.88	1.87	1.87	0.01	
8.	3.68	3.75	3.79	0.27	
9.	2.47	2.48	2.49	0.00	
10.	2.18	2.29	2.16	0.49	
11.	3.24	3.43	3.14	1.41	
12.	2.93	2.79	2.79	0.61	
13.	3.19	3.28	3.21	0.18	
14.	2.40	2.46	2.49	0.15	
15.	2.55	2.36	2.36	1.16	

*p<.05

TABLE 4.12

Mean Perceived Involvement Scores of the Staff
Group in Determining Action for Each Task
by Length of Training
(N=295)

	Length of Training				
Task No.	1. **Four years** n=119	2. **Five years** n=100	3. **Six years or more** n=76	**F**	**Difference**
1.	2.77	2.94	2.80	0.79	
2.	2.72	2.96	2.76	1.62	
3.	2.99	2.95	3.07	0.22	
4.	2.76	2.54	2.81	1.05	
5.	2.88	2.88	3.15	1.22	
6.	2.72	2.36	2.68	1.91	
7.	2.17	2.30	2.19	0.45	
8.	2.94	3.05	3.00	0.23	
9.	2.81	2.82	2.82	0.01	
10.	2.15	2.35	2.37	1.53	
11.	2.89	2.73	2.75	0.59	
12.	3.28	3.10	3.03	1.55	
13.	3.52	3.45	3.39	0.37	
14.	2.52	2.69	2.92	2.69	
15.	2.73	2.78	2.91	0.66	

$*p<.05$

TABLE 4.13

Mean Perceived Involvement Scores of the Higher Authority in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Training
(N=295)

Task No.	Length of Training 1. Four years n=119	 2. Five years n=100	 3. Six years or more n=76	F	Difference
1.	4.00	3.99	4.36	4.01*	1-3, 2-3
2.	3.32	3.23	3.46	0.89	
3.	3.16	2.97	3.12	0.58	
4.	1.95	1.80	1.77	0.85	
5.	2.32	2.23	2.23	0.23	
6.	2.20	1.86	2.01	2.17	
7.	4.32	4.17	4.46	1.84	
8.	3.25	2.84	3.23	4.22*	1-2, 2-3
9.	4.17	3.89	4.20	2.61	
10.	4.38	4.10	4.37	2.61	
11.	3.51	3.23	3.40	1.44	
12.	3.88	3.89	3.84	0.04	
13.	3.54	3.36	3.36	1.00	
14.	4.04	4.01	4.03	0.03	
15.	4.31	4.12	4.29	1.10	

$*p<.05$

Summary

A higher level of involvement of the three decision-making units was perceived regarding four cases out of 45 cases by female staff.

In the perceptions of teachers categorized by length of teaching experience, (1) teachers with the longest teaching experience perceived the higher involvement level of the individual teacher in four cases out of 45 cases, (2) no significant difference was found among the three teacher groups regarding the involvement of the formal staff group, and (3) teachers with the shortest teaching experience perceived the higher level of involvement of the higher official authority in five cases out of 45 cases.

In the perceptions of teachers categorized by length of training, there were significant differences in the involvement of the three decision-making units in four cases out of 135 cases.

Summary and Discussion

This chapter dealt with findings on (1) the distribution of decision-making authority in schools and (2) differences in the involvement in decision making by teachers categorized according to demographic variables.

The distribution of decision-making authority in schools was complex. As indicated by Lortie (1969:1), "several strands of hierarchical control, collegial control, and autonomy become tangled and complex." However, some prominent features were revealed. First, a substantial degree of teacher autonomy existed at the boundary of the classroom. Second, hierarchical control was dominant in most tasks beyond the boundary of the classroom. Third, collegial control was weak regarding most school tasks. Finally, there was a tendency for teachers to have more influence on some tasks closer to classroom management. The findings generally agreed with the literature and research on the formal authority structure of the school organization which were presented by Simpkins (1968), Meyer and Rowan (1978:78-92), Mintzberg (1979:349), and Hasenfeld (1983:164-165). For instance, Simpkins and Friesen (1969:14) stated that

> the boundary of the classroom setting provided a clear line of demarcation differentiating two contrasting participation patterns. For tasks concerned with classroom management, participation patterns were dominated by the individual teacher. For school matters outside the immediate classroom setting, participation patterns were dominated by those in higher official authority. Another feature of the data was the minor role played by the formal staff group for all twelve task activities.

Meyer and Rowan (1978:81) also posited that "actual educational work--instruction--occurs in the isolation of the self-contained classroom, removed from organizational coordination and control," whereas organizational controls are rather tight on school matters excluding classroom instruction. The findings suggested that the characteristics of the formal authority structure in schools were similar to those of semi-professional organizations observed by Etzioni (1964:82) and Scott (1981:222-224): In semi-professional organizations, professionals have less autonomy as compared with those in full-fledged professional organizations. The semi-professionals do not have authority regarding the basic definition of the organizational goals and working conditions, but may have secondary instrumental authority.

The involvement patterns of the three decision-making units were similar in the three types of schools. However, some differences were found in comparison by type of school. Teachers in the elementary school were involved more in resolving matters external to classroom management than teachers in the junior and senior high schools. The results were partly inconsistent with those of the Simpkins's study (1968) which showed somewhat higher involvement of teachers in the junior high school than the elementary and senior high schools.

In the perceptions of teachers categorized by sex, length of teaching experience, and length of training, little difference was found in the involvement of the three decision-making units regarding most tasks.

In conclusion, teacher autonomy was evident with respect to tasks in the area of classroom management, while hierarchical control was still pervasive in matters outside classroom management. Collegial control was weak regarding most tasks. However, there was a tendency for teachers to expand their influence on determining action for some tasks closer to classroom management such as (1) selection of texts and instructional material, (2) grading and promotion of students, and (3) arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling, as compared with the results of the Simpkins's study (1968).

CHAPTER 5

PREFERRED DISTRIBUTION OF DECISION-MAKING AUTHORITY

This chapter deals with findings on the distribution of decision-making authority as preferred by teachers in the elementary, junior high, and senior high schools. The distribution was determined by the relative degree of preferred involvement of the three decision-making units in each of the fifteen tasks. In addition, analyses were carried out to determine whether there were any significant differences regarding decision-making involvement in the preferences of teachers categorized by type of school, sex, length of teaching experience, and length of training of the teachers.

Preferred Involvement in Decision Making

Research Question 2.1: What is the distribution of decision-making authority preferred by teachers in the elementary, junior high, and senior high schools?

In order to investigate the question, the mean preferred involvement score of each decision-making unit in determining action for each task was calculated for each teacher group classified by type of school. The mean preferred involvement score represents the degree of preferred involvement. The relative degree was determined on the basis of significant differences in the mean preferred involvement scores of the three decision-making units with respect to each of the fifteen tasks.

Elementary School Level

As seen in Table 5.1, at the elementary school, the mean preferred involvement scores of the individual teacher were significantly higher than those of the formal staff group and the higher official authority in determining action for the three tasks (Tasks 4, 5, and 6) in the area of classroom management, along with two tasks outside classroom management: Task 8 (the grading and promotion of students) and Task 11 (arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling). For the following four tasks: Tasks 2 and 3 related to school's program planning and adaptation, Task 13 on professional development activities, and Task 14 on teacher evaluation, the mean preferred involvement scores of both the individual teacher and the formal staff group were significantly higher than the scores of the higher official authority. The mean preferred involvement scores among the three decision-making units were not significantly different regarding three tasks external to classroom management: Task 9 (the allocation of money to individuals and groups of teachers for instructional aids and equipment), Task 10 (the teaching load and other duties of teachers), and Task 15 (the expenditure patterns of school-based budgets). Another feature of the data indicated that the higher involvement of

TABLE 5.1

Mean Involvement Scores of Three Decision-Making Units in Determining Action for Each Task as Preferred by Elementary School Teachers
(N=66)

	D-M Units*			
Tasks	1	2	3	**Diff****
Determination of				
1. School's total program.	3.52	3.92	3.75	1-2
2. Detailed content of the school's program.	3.73	3.71	3.28	1-3, 2-3
3. Texts and instructional material for subjects.	4.02	3.98	3.19	1-3, 2-3
4. The way a subject is presented in class.	4.71	2.85	2.03	1-2, 1-3 2-3
5. Frequency and methods of classroom testing.	4.25	3.29	2.32	1-2, 1-3 2-3
6. Friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	4.63	3.13	2.65	1-2, 1-3
7. Size and composition of classes.	4.10	4.00	3.57	1-3
8. Grading and promotion of students.	4.47	3.59	3.11	1-2, 1-3
9. Allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	3.79	3.81	3.62	none
10. Teaching load and other duties of teachers.	3.87	3.63	3.48	none
11. Arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling.	4.33	3.52	3.25	1-2, 1-3
12. School rules/regulations for general student body.	4.14	4.27	3.81	2-3
13. Nature of organized professional development activities.	4.03	4.05	3.14	1-3, 2-3
14. How teachers are to be evaluated.	4.02	4.08	3.46	1-3, 2-3
15. Expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	3.73	3.89	3.81	none

*1=Individual Teacher, 2=Staff Group, 3=Higher Authority.
**Significant beyond the .01 level.

the formal staff group was preferred regarding two tasks: Task 1 (the School's total program) and Task 12 (school rules and regulations for general student body).

Junior High School Level

At the junior high school, as shown in Table 5.2, the mean preferred involvement scores of the individual teacher were significantly higher than the scores of the formal staff group and the higher official authority in determining action for five tasks. These were the three tasks (Tasks 4, 5, and 6) concerning classroom management and other two tasks dealing with outside classroom management: Task 8 (the grading and promotion of students) and Task 11 (arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling). For Task 1 (the school's total program), the mean preferred involvement score of the formal staff group was significantly higher than the scores of both the individual teacher and the higher official authority. Besides the six tasks (Tasks 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 11) mentioned above, the preferred involvement of both the individual teacher and the formal staff group was higher regarding the remaining nine tasks which dealt with outside classroom management.

TABLE 5.2

Mean Involvement Scores of Three Decision-Making Units
in Determining Action for Each Task as Preferred
by Junior High School Teachers
(N=83)

	D-M Units*			
Tasks	1	2	3	**Diff****
Determination of				
1. School's total program.	3.40	3.82	3.21	1-2, 2-3
2. Detailed content of the school's program.	3.48	3.63	2.71	1-3, 2-3
3. Texts and instructional material for subjects.	3.84	3.73	2.59	1-3, 2-3
4. The way a subject is presented in class.	4.54	3.19	1.78	1-2, 1-3 2-3
5. Frequency and methods of classroom testing.	4.45	3.52	1.87	1-2, 1-3 2-3
6. Friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	4.40	3.04	1.81	1-2, 1-3 2-3
7. Size and composition of classes.	3.99	3.95	2.80	1-3, 2-3
8. Grading and promotion of students.	4.28	3.89	2.70	1-2, 1-3 2-3
9. Allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	3.79	3.82	3.02	1-3, 2-3
10. Teaching load and other duties of teachers.	3.66	3.47	3.04	1-3
11. Arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling.	3.99	3.46	2.80	1-2, 1-3 2-3
12. School rules/regulations for general student body.	3.72	4.02	3.21	1-3, 2-3
13. Nature of organized professional development activities.	3.83	4.05	2.88	1-3, 2-3
14. How teachers are to be evaluated.	3.95	3.96	2.90	1-3, 2-3
15. Expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	3.70	3.89	3.10	1-3, 2-3

*1=Individual Teacher, 2=Staff Group, 3=Higher Authority.
**Significant beyond the .01 level.

Senior High School Level

As presented in Table 5.3, at the senior high school, the mean preferred involvement scores of the individual teacher were significantly higher than the scores of both the formal staff group and the higher official authority in determining action for the three tasks (Tasks 4, 5, and 6) in the area of classroom management and three tasks outside classroom management: Task 3 (the texts and instructional material for various subjects), Task 8 (the grading and promotion of students), and Task 11 (arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling). For Task 12 (school rules and regulations for the general student body) and Task 15 (the expenditure patterns of school-based budgets), the mean preferred involvement scores of the formal staff group were significantly higher than the scores of the individual teacher and the higher official authority. On the other hand, the mean preferred involvement scores of both the individual teacher and the formal staff group were significantly higher than the scores of the higher official authority with respect to five tasks of outside classroom management: Tasks 7 and 9 related to arrangement of school instructional program, Task 10 on the teaching load and other duties of teachers, Task 13 on professional development activities, and Task 14 on teacher evaluation. Another feature of the data indicated the significantly

TABLE 5.3

Mean Involvement Scores of Three Decision-Making Units in Determining Action for Each Task as Preferred by Senior High School Teachers (N=149)

Tasks	**D-M Units*** 1	2	3	**Diff****
Determination of				
1. School's total program.	3.15	3.74	3.55	1-2, 1-3
2. Detailed content of the school's program.	3.31	3.54	2.99	2-3
3. Texts and instructional material for subjects.	3.85	3.53	2.68	1-2, 1-3 2-3
4. The way a subject is presented in class.	4.56	2.82	1.75	1-2, 1-3 2-3
5. Frequency and methods of classroom testing.	4.31	3.07	2.04	1-2, 1-3 2-3
6. Friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	4.49	2.58	2.07	1-2, 1-3 2-3
7. Size and composition of classes.	3.74	3.69	3.01	1-3, 2-3
8. Grading and promotion of students.	4.29	3.41	2.53	1-2, 1-3 2-3
9. Allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	3.53	3.69	3.17	1-3, 2-3
10. Teaching load and other duties of teachers.	3.55	3.50	3.06	1-3, 2-3
11. Arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling.	3.77	3.23	3.06	1-2, 1-3
12. School rules/regulations for general student body.	3.43	3.86	3.39	1-2, 2-3
13. Nature of organized professional development activities.	3.77	3.97	2.89	1-3, 2-3
14. How teachers are to be evaluated.	3.88	3.90	2.99	1-3, 2-3
15. Expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	3.48	3.81	3.36	1-2, 2-3

*1=Individual Teacher, 2=Staff Group, 3=Higher Authority.
**Signifificnat beyond the .01 level.

higher mean preferred involvement scores for both the formal staff group and the higher official authority in resolving matters on the school's total program.

Summary

First, teachers at all three levels preferred the individual teacher not only to maintain a major role in deciding matters of classroom management but also to extend his/her influence to three more tasks closely associated with classroom management: (1) texts and instructional material for subjects, (2) the grading and promotion of students, and (3) arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling. Second, teachers preferred the individual teacher and the formal staff group to have a leading role in determining action for a majority of tasks outside classroom management. Third, greater involvement of both the formal staff group and the higher official authority was preferred in deciding the school's total program. Finally, teachers desired less involvement of the higher official authority in determining action for most tasks.

Differences in Preferred Involvement in Decision Making by Type of School

Research Question 2.2: What significant differences exist in the involvement of each decision-making unit in determining action for each of the fifteen tasks in the preferences of teachers categorized by type of school?

In order to examine the question, the mean preferred involvement score of each decision-making unit with respect to each task was calculated for each group of teachers classified by type of school. The one-way analysis of variance, ANOVA, was used to test for significant differences among the mean preferred involvement scores of the teacher groups regarding each task.

The Individual Teacher as Decision-Making Unit

As seen in Table 5.4, the mean preferred involvement scores of the individual teacher were significantly higher at the elementary school than at the junior and senior high schools for Task 11 and 12 in the area of general school organization. The mean preferred involvement scores of the individual teacher were also significantly higher at the elementary school than at the senior high school regarding four more tasks outside classroom management: Tasks 1 and 2 (in the area of the school program planning and adaptation), Task 7 (the size and composition of classes), and Task 15 (the expenditure patterns of school-based budgets). For Task 9 (the allocation of money to individuals and groups of teachers for instructional aids and equipment), the mean preferred involvement score of the individual teacher was significantly higher at the junior high school than at the senior high school. In no case was the mean preferred involvement score of the individual teacher higher at the

TABLE 5.4

Mean Preferred Involvement Scores of the Individual
Teacher in Determining Action for Each Task
by Type of School
(N=298)

	Type of School				
Tasks	1.Elem n=66	2.JHS n=83	3.SHS n=149	F	Diff
Determination of					
1. School's total program.	3.52	3.38	3.16	4.26*	1-3
2. Detailed content of the school's program.	3.74	3.46	3.31	4.93**	1-3
3. Texts and instructional material for subjects.	4.02	3.83	3.83	1.16	
4. The way a subject is presented in class.	4.71	4.51	4.56	1.50	
5. Frequency and methods of classroom testing.	4.27	4.45	4.30	1.16	
6. Friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	4.63	4.41	4.48	1.30	
7. Size and composition of classes.	4.09	3.99	3.74	4.76**	1-3
8. Grading and promotion of students.	4.44	4.29	4.29	1.29	
9. Allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	3.78	3.77	3.51	3.51*	2-3
10. Teaching load and other duties of teachers.	3.86	3.64	3.55	2.74	
11. Arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling.	4.32	3.99	3.76	12.25**	1-2 1-3
12. School rules/regulations for general student body.	4.12	3.73	3.43	13.89**	1-2 1-3 2-3
13. Nature of organized professional development activities.	4.05	3.83	3.76	2.84	
14. How teachers are to be evaluated.	4.03	3.95	3.87	0.77	
15. Expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	3.77	3.68	3.48	3.02*	1-3

$^{*}p<.05$, $^{**}p<.01$

senior high school than at the elementary and junior high schools.

The Formal Staff Group as Decision-Making Unit

As indicated in Table 5.5, there were no significant differences in the mean preferred involvement scores of the formal staff group in determining action for a great majority of tasks in the preferences of the three teacher groups. However, the mean preferred involvement scores of the formal staff group were significantly higher at the elementary school than at the senior high school for three tasks outside classroom management: Task 3 (the texts and instructional material for various subjects), Task 7 (the size and composition of classes), and Task 12 (school rules and regulations for the general student body). For Task 8 (the grading and promotion of students), the mean preferred involvement score of the formal staff group was significantly higher at the junior high school than at the senior high school. It is noteworthy that the lower involvement of the formal staff group was preferred by senior high school teachers regarding two tasks in the area of classroom management, compared with teachers in the elementary and junior high schools.

The Higher Official Authority as Decision-Making Unit

As seen in Table 5.6, the mean preferred involvement scores of the higher official authority were significantly higher at the elementary school than at the junior and

TABLE 5.5

Mean Preferred Involvement Scores of the Formal Staff
Group in Determining Action for Each Task
by Type of School
(N=298)

Tasks	1.Elem n=66	2.JHS n=83	3.SHS n=149	F	Diff
Determination of					
1. School's total program.	3.92	3.82	3.74	1.33	
2. Detailed content of the school's program.	3.71	3.63	3.54	0.71	
3. Texts and instructional material for subjects.	3.98	3.73	3.53	4.25*	1-3
4. The way a subject is presented in class.	2.86	3.20	2.82	1.98	
5. Frequency and methods of classroom testing.	3.29	3.52	3.07	3.23*	2-3
6. Friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	3.13	3.04	2.55	4.77**	1-3 2-3
7. Size and composition of classes.	4.00	3.94	3.68	3.15*	1-3
8. Grading and promotion of students.	3.51	3.89	3.42	4.79**	2-3
9. Allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	3.81	3.83	3.69	0.84	
10. Teaching load and other duties of teachers.	3.63	3.47	3.50	0.47	
11. Arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling.	3.52	3.47	3.23	2.05	
12. School rules/regulations for general student body.	4.27	4.02	3.86	5.95**	1-3
13. Nature of organized professional development activities.	4.05	4.05	3.97	0.38	
14. How teachers are to be evaluated.	4.08	3.96	3.90	0.75	
15. Expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	3.89	3.89	3.81	0.35	

Type of School: 1.Elem, 2.JHS, 3.SHS

*$p<.05$, **$p<.01$

TABLE 5.6

Mean Preferred Involvement Scores of the Higher Official Authority in Determining Action for Each Task by Type of School
(N=298)

Tasks	Type of School 1.Elem n=66	 2.JHS n=83	 3.SHS n=149	F	Diff
Determination of					
1. School's total program.	3.75	3.21	3.55	6.03**	1-2 2-3
2. Detailed content of the school's program.	3.28	2.71	2.99	6.17**	1-2
3. Texts and instructional material for subjects.	3.19	2.59	2.68	6.40**	1-2 1-3
4. The way a subject is presented in class.	2.02	1.80	1.74	1.62	
5. Frequency and methods of classroom testing.	2.32	1.87	2.04	3.45*	1-2
6. Friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	2.68	1.81	2.04	11.11**	1-2 1-3
7. Size and composition of classes.	3.55	2.80	3.01	9.48**	1-2 1-3
8. Grading and promotion of students.	3.11	2.70	2.53	6.94**	1-2 1-3
9. Allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	3.61	3.00	3.17	6.76**	1-2 1-3
10. Teaching load and other duties of teachers.	3.48	3.04	3.06	4.32*	1-2 1-3
11. Arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling.	3.25	2.82	3.06	2.76	
12. School rules/regulations for general student body.	3.81	3.21	3.38	6.10**	1-2 1-3
13. Nature of organized professional development activities.	3.14	2.88	2.89	1.69	
14. How teachers are to be evaluated.	3.46	2.90	2.99	6.57**	1-2 1-3
15. Expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	3.81	3.10	3.36	9.22**	1-2 1-3

$^*p<.05$, $^{**}p<.01$

senior high schools regarding nine tasks. These were Task 3 on the selection of texts and instructional material, Task 6 related to classroom management, Tasks 7, 8, and 9 regarding arrangement of school instructional program, Tasks 10 and 12 concerning general school organization, Task 14 on teacher evaluation, and Task 15 on school-based budgets. The mean preferred involvement scores of the higher official authority were also significantly higher at the elementary school than at the junior high school for Task 2 (the detailed content of the school's program) and Task 5 (frequency and methods of classroom testing). For Task 1 (the school's total program), the mean preferred involvement score of the higher official authority was significantly higher at the elementary and senior high schools than at the junior high school.

Summary

The preferred involvement level of the individual teacher was significantly higher at the elementary school than at the junior high school for two tasks outside classroom management and also significantly higher than at the senior high school for six tasks outside classroom mangement. The preferred involvement level of the individual teacher at the junior high school was significantly higher than at the senior high school for two tasks external to classroom management. In no case was the preferred involvement level of the individual teacher higher at the senior high school than at the elementary and junior high schools.

The preferred involvement level of the formal staff group was significantly higher at the elementary school than at the senior high school for four tasks (one task in the area of classroom management and three tasks outside classroom management), and significantly higher at the junior high school than at the senior high school for three tasks (two tasks in the area of classroom management and one task on the grading and promotion of students).

The preferred involvement level of the higher official authority was significantly higher at the elementary school than at the junior high school for twelve tasks (two tasks in the area of classroom management and ten tasks outside classroom management), and also significantly higher at the elementary school than at the senior high school for nine tasks (one task in the area of classroom management and eight tasks outside classroom management).

Differences in Preferred Involvement in Decision Making by Demographic Variables

In this section, analyses were conducted to determine whether there were any significant differences in the involvement of each decision-making unit in determining action for each task in the preferences of teachers categorized by demographic variables.

Male and Female

Research Question 2.3: What significant differences exist in the involvement of each decision-making unit in determining action for each of the fifteen tasks in the preferences of teachers categorized by sex?

Table 5.7 shows the mean preferred involvement scores by sex. In comparison with male staff, female staff preferred: (1) the higher involvement of the individual teacher regarding two tasks in the area of classroom management and six tasks external to classroom management, (2) the higher involvement of the formal staff group regarding eight tasks outside classroom management, and (3) the higher involvement of the higher official authority regarding one task for classroom management and three tasks outside classroom managment. The preferred involvement level of the three decision-making units by male staff was not significantly higher than that of female staff in any case.

Length of Teaching Experience

Research Question 2.4: What significant differences exit in the involvement of each decision-making unit in determining action for each of the fifteen tasks in the preferences of teachers categorized by length of teaching experience?

As indicated in Tables 5.8, 5.9, and 5.10, there were no significant differences in the mean involvement scores of the three decision-making units with respect to all 135 cases except for seven in the preferences of teacher groups classified by length of teaching experience. As shown

TABLE 5.7

Mean Preferred Involvement Scores of Each Decision-Making Units in Determining Action for Each Task by Sex (N=298)

Task	Individual Teacher			Staff Group			Higher Authority		
No.	**M** n=156	**F** n=142	*t*	**M** n=156	**F** n=142	*t*	**M** n=156	**F** n=142	*t*
1.	3.24	3.37	-1.30	3.70	3.91	-2.46*	3.39	3.61	-1.87
2.	3.46	3.44	0.19	3.51	3.70	-1.68	2.79	3.18	-3.37**
3.	3.77	3.97	-1.99*	3.52	3.87	-2.85**	2.66	2.88	-1.68
4.	4.50	4.67	-2.06*	2.91	2.95	-0.24	1.83	1.82	0.09
5.	4.32	4.36	-0.39	3.21	3.29	-0.50	1.97	2.14	-1.35
6.	4.38	4.61	-2.47*	2.76	2.86	-0.54	1.96	2.29	-2.40*
7.	3.80	3.97	-1.70	3.72	3.93	-1.90	3.03	3.13	-0.83
8.	4.25	4.41	-2.05*	3.52	3.64	-0.88	2.62	2.81	-1.47
9.	3.60	3.69	-0.83	3.65	3.88	-2.25*	3.13	3.32	-1.54
10.	3.52	3.77	-2.40*	3.34	3.71	-3.01**	3.10	3.21	-0.90
11.	3.78	4.13	-3.88**	3.20	3.53	-2.51*	3.00	3.08	-0.61
12.	3.53	3.80	-2.53*	3.84	4.17	-3.54**	3.28	3.60	-2.46*
13.	3.72	3.98	-2.87**	3.90	4.13	-2.52*	2.91	2.99	-0.73
14.	3.83	4.03	-1.93	3.76	4.18	-3.89**	2.98	3.19	-1.74
15.	3.57	3.62	-0.52	3.79	3.93	-1.44	3.27	3.52	-2.04*

M=Male, F=Female
*$p<.05$, **$p<.01$

TABLE 5.8

Mean Preferred Involvement Scores of the Individual Teacher in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Teaching Experience
(N=298)

	Length of Teaching experience				
Task No.	1. 5 years or less n=41	2. 6-10 years n=66	3. 11 years or more n=191	F	Difference
1.	3.46	3.24	3.29	0.83	
2.	3.49	3.50	3.42	0.21	
3.	3.83	4.06	3.81	2.13	
4.	4.44	4.71	4.56	1.87	
5.	4.22	4.50	4.31	1.84	
6.	4.40	4.66	4.45	1.77	
7.	4.00	4.03	3.81	2.11	
8.	4.07	4.48	4.32	4.80**	1-2
9.	3.66	3.51	3.69	1.06	
10.	3.71	3.86	3.55	3.07*	2-3
11.	3.78	4.20	3.89	4.78**	1-2, 2-3
12.	3.63	3.67	3.67	0.02	
13.	3.80	3.92	3.82	0.45	
14.	3.83	3.89	3.96	0.41	
15.	3.49	3.67	3.59	0.52	

*$p<.05$, **$p<.01$

TABLE 5.9

Mean Preferred Involvement Scores of the Formal Staff Group in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Teaching Experience (N=298)

Task No.	Length of Teaching Experience 1. 5 years or less n=41	2. 6-10 years n=66	3. 11 years or more n=191	F	Difference
1.	3.80	3.88	3.78	0.41	
2.	3.70	3.66	3.56	0.45	
3.	3.73	3.83	3.63	0.89	
4.	3.35	2.67	2.93	2.93	
5.	3.38	3.19	3.24	0.26	
6.	3.23	2.48	2.83	3.21*	1-2
7.	3.98	3.83	3.78	0.62	
8.	3.70	3.47	3.58	0.51	
9.	3.90	3.76	3.72	0.68	
10.	3.58	3.67	3.45	1.09	
11.	3.33	3.37	3.36	0.02	
12.	4.00	4.29	3.89	6.20**	2-3
13.	3.93	4.27	3.94	4.40*	2-3
14.	3.80	4.14	3.92	1.86	
15.	3.93	3.86	3.83	0.20	

$*p<.05$, $**p<.01$

TABLE 5.10

Mean Preferred Involvement Scores of the Higher Official Authority in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Teaching Experience (N=298)

Task No.	Length of Teaching Experience 1. 5 years or less n=41	2. 6-10 years n=66	3. 11 years or more n=191	F	Difference
1.	3.40	3.37	3.56	1.15	
2.	3.03	2.91	2.98	0.20	
3.	2.70	2.78	2.77	0.08	
4.	1.73	1.62	1.92	2.38	
5.	2.10	1.92	2.09	0.65	
6.	2.25	1.92	2.16	1.29	
7.	2.83	2.88	3.21	3.59	
8.	2.93	2.60	2.71	1.19	
9.	3.25	3.06	3.28	1.05	
10.	3.05	3.02	3.22	1.20	
11.	3.23	2.86	3.06	1.39	
12.	3.43	3.38	3.45	0.08	
13.	3.15	2.92	2.91	0.99	
14.	3.25	3.09	3.03	0.78	
15.	3.35	3.25	3.45	0.99	

*$p < .05$

in Table 5.8, the higher involvement level of the individual teacher was preferred by teachers with a medium length of teaching experience (6-10 years) for three tasks. These were Task 8 (the grading and promotion of students), Task 10 (the teaching load and other duties of teachers) and Task 12 (school rules and regulations for the general student body). As seen in Table 5.9, the higher involvement level of the formal staff group was also preferred by teachers with a medium length of teaching experience regarding Task 12 and Task 13 (the nature of organized professional development activities). For Task 6 (the relative friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships), teachers with the shortest length of teaching experience (5 years or less) preferred the higher involvement level of the formal staff group. There was no significant difference in the preferred involvement scores of the higher official authority, as indicated in Table 5.10.

Length of Training

Research Question 2.5: What significant differences exist in the involvement of each decision-making unit in determining action for each of the fifteen tasks in the preferences of teachers categorized by length of training?

As seen in Table 5.11, there were no significant differences in the mean involvement scores of the individual teacher in determining action for all except two tasks in the preferences of teachers classified by length of training. That is, the higher involvement level of the

TABLE 5.11

Mean Preferred Involvement Scores of the Individual Teacher in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Training
(N=295)

Task No.	Length of Training 1. Four years n=119	2. Five years n=100	3. Six years or more n=76	F	Difference
1.	3.43	3.26	3.16	2.28	
2.	3.54	3.53	3.20	3.59*	1-3, 2-3
3.	3.89	3.90	3.79	0.42	
4.	4.53	4.64	4.59	0.58	
5.	4.31	4.41	4.33	0.47	
6.	4.55	4.51	4.38	1.04	
7.	4.01	3.81	3.79	2.10	
8.	4.30	4.33	4.35	0.12	
9.	3.70	3.68	3.50	1.38	
10.	3.78	3.52	3.58	2.52	
11.	4.06	4.00	3.72	4.53*	1-3, 2-3
12.	3.80	3.59	3.57	1.97	
13.	3.89	3.75	3.89	1.06	
14.	3.94	3.82	4.03	1.16	
15.	3.69	3.51	3.55	1.17	

*$p<.05$

TABLE 5.12

Mean Preferred Involvement Scores of the Formal Staff Group in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Training
(N=295)

	Length of Training				
Task No.	1. Four years n=119	2. Five years n=100	3. Six years or more n=76	F	Difference
1.	3.78	3.90	3.72	1.32	
2.	3.64	3.66	3.45	1.14	
3.	3.72	3.64	3.73	0.21	
4.	3.00	2.83	2.96	0.42	
5.	3.33	3.14	3.27	0.55	
6.	3.00	2.61	2.77	1.85	
7.	3.93	3.85	3.62	2.30	
8.	3.57	3.61	3.53	0.09	
9.	3.78	3.87	3.57	2.49	
10.	3.53	3.60	3.39	0.87	
11.	3.44	3.33	3.28	0.53	
12.	4.09	3.97	3.89	1.37	
13.	4.07	3.99	3.91	0.95	
14.	3.99	3.92	3.95	0.16	
15.	3.84	3.84	3.88	0.07	

*$p < .05$

TABLE 5.13

Mean Preferred Involvement Scores of the Higher Official Authority in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Training (N=295)

Task No.	Length of Training 1. Four years n=119	2. Five years n=100	3. Six years or more n=76	F	Difference
1.	3.51	3.38	3.63	1.36	
2.	3.04	2.81	3.06	1.79	
3.	2.85	2.61	2.77	1.25	
4.	1.90	1.78	1.70	0.92	
5.	2.12	2.01	1.97	0.53	
6.	2.23	1.99	2.09	1.16	
7.	3.01	3.00	3.29	1.83	
8.	2.84	2.53	2.73	2.33	
9.	3.20	3.16	3.34	0.70	
10.	3.14	3.04	3.30	1.29	
11.	3.09	2.85	3.17	1.94	
12.	3.44	3.30	3.56	1.16	
13.	2.94	3.00	2.86	0.43	
14.	3.07	3.08	3.09	0.01	
15.	3.40	3.32	3.44	0.30	

*$p<.05$

individual teacher was preferred by teachers with four or five years of training, regarding Task 2 (the detailed content of the school's program) and Task 11 (arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling). There were no significant differences in the preferred involvement scores of both the formal staff group and the higher official authority regarding all tasks, as presented in Tables 5.12 and 5.13.

Summary

A higher level of involvement of the individual teacher and the staff group was preferred regarding 16 out of 30 cases by female staff than by male staff.

Teachers with the medium length of teaching experience (6-10 years) preferred a higher involvement of either the individual teacher or the formal staff group in six cases out of 90. On the other hand, teachers with the shortest length of teaching experience (5 years or less) preferred a higher involvement of the formal staff group in one case out of 45. There were no significant differences in the preferred involvement of the higher official authority with respect to all tasks.

There were no significant differences in the involvement level of the three decision-making units regarding all 135 cases except for four in the preferences of teachers categorized by length of training.

Summary and Discussion

This chapter presented findings on (1) the preferred distribution of decision-making authority in schools and (2) differences in the preferred involvement in decision making by teachers categorized according to demographic variables.

The distribution of decision-making authority preferred by teachers in schools was also complex. First, teachers preferred not only to maintain a substantial degree of autonomy within the boundary of classroom but also to extend their autonomy to a few more tasks closely related to classroom instruction such as (1) selection of texts and instructional material, (2) grading and promotion of students, and (3) arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling. Second, teachers preferred collegial control with respect to a majority of tasks beyond the boundary of classroom, particularly with the following tasks: (1) detailed content of the school's program, (2) resource allocation, (3) school rules and regulations for the general student body, (4) organized professional development activities, and (5) teacher evaluation. Third, teachers preferred both collegial control and hierarchical control regarding the school's total program. Finally, teachers wished to have less hierarchical control regarding most school matters. The findings were generally supported by other studies conducted by Simpkins (1968), Isherwood and Taylor (1978). According to Simpkins and Friesen (1969:15),

> the individual teacher wished to protect his jurisdiction in classroom decision-making from the authority exercised both by his colleague group and by those in administrative positions. . . . For these tasks [tasks external to classroom management], however, they [teachers] would have preferred to have decision-making authority distributed among individual teachers, the formal staff group, and those in higher official authority according to the nature of the tasks concerned.

The findings also indicated that the characteristics of the formal authority structure preferred by teachers in schools were close to those of full-fledged professional organizations described by Etzioni (1964:81) and Scott (1981:222-224). That is, in full-fledged professional organizations, professionals exercise the major authority regarding goal definition and instrumental activities, whereas administrators have the secondary staff authority. The final decisions are made by the various professionals and their decision-making bodies.

The preferred involvement patterns of the three decision-making units for the fifteen tasks were largely similar in the three types of schools. However, significant differences were found with respect to a number of tasks in comparison by type of school. First, teachers in the senior high school tended to prefer the individual teacher to be less involved in deciding some matters external to classroom management than teachers in the elementary and junior high schools. Second, teachers in the junior and senior high schools preferred administrators to be less involved in determining action for a majority of tasks than those in the elementary school.

In the preferences of teachers categorized by length of teaching experience and length of training, a few differences were found regarding the involvement of each decision-making unit for the fifteen tasks. However, a number of differences occurred in the preferences of teachers classified by sex. Female staff preferred both the individual teacher and the formal staff group to be more involved in determining action for a majority of tasks. They also preferred the higher official authority to be more involved in a few tasks.

In conclusion, teachers wished decision-making authority to be further decentralized in comparison with the current practices. Teachers also preferred differentiated involvement of the three decision-making units depending on the nature of the tasks.

CHAPTER 6

DISCREPANCY BETWEEN PERCEIVED AND PREFERRED INVOLVEMENT IN DECISION MAKING

This chapter presents findings on the discrepancy between the perceived and the preferred involvement of each of the three decision-making units with respect to each of the fifteen tasks in schools. Analyses were also conducted to determine whether there were any significant differences in degrees of discrepancy regarding decision-making involvement by type of school, sex, length of teaching experience, and length of training of the teachers. In addition, the percentages with low and high discrepancy regarding the involvement of each decision-making unit were determined for each task.

Discrepancy between Perceived and Preferred Involvement in Decision Making

Research Question 3.1: What degree of discrepancy exists between the perceived and the preferred involvement of each of the three decision-making units regarding each of the fifteen tasks in the elementary, junior high, and senior high schools?

In order to examine the question, the mean perceived (actual) and the mean preferred involvement scores of each decision-making unit regarding each task were computed for each teacher group categorized by type of school. The *t* test of significance for correlated means was used to test the differences between the mean scores. Second, the discrepancy score was calculated by subtracting the mean preferred involvement score from the mean perceived involvement score for each task. A minus sign indicates decisional deprivation. Third, the rank order for the degree of discrepancy for each task was determined by the size of discrepancy score in the fifteen tasks.

Elementary School Level

Table 6.1 shows the discrepancy between the mean perceived and the mean preferred involvement scores of the individual teacher in determining action for each task at the elementary school. Significant differences between the mean perceived and the mean preferred involvement scores were found regarding all tasks except two (Tasks 4 and 6), both in the area of classroom management. In addition, one remaining task (Task 5) in the area of classroom management showed the least discrepancy score in comparison with all other discrepancy scores that were significant. On the other hand, the five tasks that received the largest discrepancy scores were as follows: (1) Task 7 (the size and composition of classes), (2) Task 14 (how teachers are to be evaluated), (3) Task 10 (the teaching load and other duties of teachers), (4) Task 9 (the allocation of money to individuals and groups of teachers for instructional aids and equipment), and (5) Task 15 (the expenditure patterns of

TABLE 6.1

Discrepancy between Mean Perceived and Preferred Involvement Scores of the Individual Teacher Determining Action for Each Task (Elementary School)
(N=66)

Tasks	Actual	Pref	Discrep	*t*	RO
Determination of					
1. School's total program.	2.65	3.52	-0.87	-8.18*	7
2. Detailed content of the school's program.	2.92	3.72	-0.80	-6.64*	8
3. Texts and instructional material for subjects.	3.34	4.00	-0.66	-4.34*	12
4. The way a subject is presented in class.	4.62	4.71	-0.09	-2.18	14
5. Frequency and methods of classroom testing.	3.67	4.27	-0.60	-4.29*	13
6. Friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	4.55	4.63	-0.08	-1.40	15
7. Size and composition of classes.	2.28	4.09	-1.81	-10.88*	1
8. Grading and promotion of students.	3.67	4.44	-0.77	-5.62*	10
9. Allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	2.68	3.78	-1.10	-7.14*	4
10. Teaching load and other duties of teachers.	2.60	3.86	-1.26	-7.81*	3
11. Arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling.	3.60	4.32	-0.72	-5.06*	11
12. School rules/regulations for general student body.	3.32	4.12	-0.80	-6.10*	8
13. Nature of organized professional development activities.	3.09	4.05	-0.96	-6.79*	6
14. How teachers are to be evaluated.	2.56	4.05	-1.49	-7.89*	2
15. Expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	2.74	3.77	-1.03	-6.02*	5

*Significant beyond the .01 level.
RO=Rank order based on size of discrepancy.

school-based budgets).

Table 6.2 presents the degree of discrepancy in the involvement of the formal staff group for each task at the elementary school. There were significant differences in the mean perceived and preferred involvement scores with respect to all tasks except for two tasks (Tasks 4 and 6) concerning classroom management. One remaining task (Task 5) in the area of classroom management also showed a relatively small discrepancy score in comparison with those of the other tasks. On the other hand, the five tasks indicating the largest discrepancy scores were as follows: (1) Task 14 (how teachers are to be evaluated), (2) Task 7 (the size and composition of classes), (3) Task 10 (the teaching load and other duties of teachers), (4) Task 15 (the expenditure patterns of school-based budgets), and (5) Task 9 (the allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment).

As seen in Table 6.3, there were significant differences between the mean perceived and the mean preferred involvement scores of the higher official authority for seven tasks: one task (Task 5) in the area of classroom management and the other six tasks outside classroom management. The score for Task 5 (frequency and methods of classroom testing) indicated that the higher official authority was actually involved more than teachers would have preferred. The tasks that received the five

TABLE 6.2

Discrepancy between Mean Perceived and Preferred Involvement Scores of the Staff Group in Determining Action for Each Task (Elementary School)
(N=66)

Tasks	Actual	Pref	Discrep	*t*	RO
Determination of					
1. School's total program.	3.09	3.92	-0.83	-7.36*	6
2. Detailed content of the school's program.	3.00	3.71	-0.71	-6.03*	11
3. Texts and instructional material for subjects.	3.21	3.98	-0.77	-6.32*	7
4. The way a subject is presented in class.	2.75	2.86	-0.11	-1.63	15
5. Frequency and methods of classroom testing.	2.56	3.29	-0.73	-4.70*	10
6. Friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	2.97	3.13	-0.16	-2.10	14
7. Size and composition of classes.	2.51	4.00	-1.49	-8.59*	2
8. Grading and promotion of students.	2.77	3.51	-0.74	-5.27*	9
9. Allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	2.90	3.81	-0.90	-6.60*	5
10. Teaching load and other duties of teachers.	2.41	3.63	-1.22	-8.19*	3
11. Arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling.	2.98	3.52	-0.54	-4.30*	13
12. School rules/regulations for general student body.	3.52	4.27	-0.75	-5.95*	8
13. Nature of organized professional development activities.	3.44	4.05	-0.61	-4.65*	12
14. How teachers are to be evaluated.	2.58	4.08	-1.50	-7.84*	1
15. Expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	2.83	3.89	-1.06	-6.02*	4

*Significant beyond the .01 level.
RO=Rank order based on size of discrepancy.

TABLE 6.3

Discrepancy between Mean Perceived and Preferred Involvement Scores of the Higher Authority in Determining Action for Each Task (Elementary School)
(N=66)

Tasks	Actual	Pref	Discrep	*t*	RO
Determination of					
1. School's total program.	4.03	3.75	0.28	2.06	9
2. Detailed content of the school's program.	3.22	3.28	-0.06	-0.54	15
3. Texts and instructional material for subjects.	3.41	3.19	0.22	1.60	11
4. The way a subject is presented in class.	1.88	2.02	-0.14	-1.64	13
5. Frequency and methods of classroom testing.	2.71	2.32	0.39	2.94*	7
6. Friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	2.41	2.68	-0.27	-2.42	10
7. Size and composition of classes.	4.47	3.55	0.92	5.52*	1
8. Grading and promotion of students.	3.44	3.11	0.33	2.49	8
9. Allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	4.09	3.61	0.48	3.08*	6
10. Teaching load and other duties of teachers.	4.29	3.48	0.81	5.81*	2
11. Arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling.	3.40	3.25	0.15	1.38	12
12. School rules/regulations for general student body.	3.70	3.81	-0.11	-0.94	14
13. Nature of organized professional development activities.	3.75	3.14	0.61	4.87*	3
14. How teachers are to be evaluated.	3.97	3.48	0.49	2.82*	5
15. Expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	4.40	3.81	0.59	4.07*	4

*Significant beyond the .01 level.
RO=Rank order based on size of discrepancy.

largest positive discrepancy scores of the higher official authority were as follows: (1) Task 7 (the size and composition of classes), (2) Task 10 (the teaching load and other duties of teachers), (3) Task 13 (the nature of organized professional development activities), (4) Task 15 (the expenditure patterns of school-based budgets), and (5) Task 14 (how teachers are to be evaluated).

Junior High School Level

Table 6.4 presents the discrepancy between the mean perceived and the mean preferred involvement scores of the individual teacher in determining action for each task at the junior high school. The discrepancy scores were significant for all tasks except the three tasks (Tasks 4, 5, and 6) concerning classroom management. On the other hand, the five tasks indicating the largest discrepancy scores were as follows: (1) Task 7 (the size and composition of classes), (2) Task 14 (how teachers are to be evaluated), (3) Task 10 (the teaching load and other duties of teachers), (4) Task 9 (the allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment), and (5) Task 15 (the expenditure patterns of school-based budgets).

Table 6.5 shows the degree of discrepancy in the involvement of the formal staff group for each task. Significant differences in the mean perceived and preferred involvement scores occurred regarding all tasks except one task (Task 5) in the area of classroom management.

TABLE 6.4

Discrepancy between Mean Perceived and Preferred Involvement Scores of the Individual Teacher Determining Action for Each Task (Junior High School)
(N=83)

Tasks	Actual	Pref	Discrep	*t*	RO
Determination of					
1. School's total program.	2.26	3.38	-1.12	-10.15*	6
2. Detailed content of the school's program.	2.57	3.46	-0.89	-7.95*	7
3. Texts and instructional material for subjects.	2.99	3.83	-0.84	-7.09*	8
4. The way a subject is presented in class.	4.31	4.51	-0.20	-2.27	13
5. Frequency and methods of classroom testing.	4.26	4.45	-0.19	-2.11	14
6. Friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	4.30	4.41	-0.11	-1.58	15
7. Size and composition of classes.	1.73	3.99	-2.26	-17.43*	1
8. Grading and promotion of students.	3.46	4.29	-0.83	-7.14*	9
9. Allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	2.51	3.77	-1.26	-9.68*	4
10. Teaching load and other duties of teachers.	2.20	3.64	-1.44	-9.86*	3
11. Arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling.	3.20	3.99	-0.79	-6.08*	10
12. School rules/regulations for general student body.	2.95	3.73	-0.78	-6.64*	11
13. Nature of organized professional development activities.	3.24	3.83	-0.59	-4.73*	12
14. How teachers are to be evaluated.	2.41	3.95	-1.54	-9.11*	2
15. Expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	2.42	3.68	-1.26	-9.09*	4

*Significant beyond the .01 level.
RO=Rank order based on size of discrepancy.

TABLE 6.5

Discrepancy between Mean Perceived and Preferred Involvement Scores of the Staff Group in Determining Action for Each Task (Junior High School) (N=83)

Tasks	Actual	Pref	Discrep	*t*	RO
Determination of					
1. School's total program.	2.73	3.82	-1.09	-8.44*	6
2. Detailed content of the school's program.	2.84	3.63	-0.79	-6.52*	10
3. Texts and instructional material for subjects.	2.91	3.73	-0.82	-6.02*	8
4. The way a subject is presented in class.	2.78	3.20	-0.42	-3.93*	14
5. Frequency and methods of classroom testing.	3.29	3.52	-0.23	-2.08	15
6. Friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	2.61	3.04	-0.43	-4.22*	13
7. Size and composition of classes.	2.11	3.94	-1.83	-11.81*	1
8. Grading and promotion of students.	3.10	3.90	-0.80	-6.51*	9
9. Allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	2.66	3.83	-1.17	-9.21*	5
10. Teaching load and other duties of teachers.	2.04	3.47	-1.43	-10.05*	3
11. Arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling.	2.70	3.47	-0.77	-5.84*	11
12. School rules/regulations for general student body.	3.10	4.02	-0.92	-6.72*	7
13. Nature of organized professional development activities.	3.30	4.05	-0.75	-5.83*	12
14. How teachers are to be evaluated.	2.48	3.96	-1.48	-8.60*	2
15. Expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	2.63	3.89	-1.26	-9.77*	4

*Significant beyond the .01 level.
RO=Rank order based on size of discrepancy.

The remaining two tasks (Tasks 4 and 6) concerning classroom management also showed the two least significant discrepancy scores. On the other hand, the tasks indicating the five largest discrepancy scores were as follows: (1) Task 7 (the size and composition of classes), (2) Task 14 (how teachers are to be evaluated), (3) Task 10 (the teaching load and other duties of teachers, (4) Task 15 (the expenditure patterns of school-based budgets), and (5) Task 9 (the allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment).

As indicated in Table 6.6, there were no significant differences between the mean perceived and preferred involvement scores of the higher official authority with respect to four tasks: the three tasks (Tasks 4, 5, and 6) of classroom management and one task on selection of texts and instructional materials. On the other hand, the five tasks that received the largest positive discrepancy scores were as follows: (1) Task 7 (the size and composition of classes), (2) Task 10 (the teaching load and other duties of teachers), (3) Task 9 (the allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment), (4) Task 14 (how teachers are to be evaluated), and (5) Task 15 (the expenditure patterns of school-based budgets).

TABLE 6.6

Discrepancy between Mean Perceived and Preferred Involvement Scores of the Higher Authority in Determining Action for Each Task (Junior High School)
(N=83)

Tasks	Actual	Pref	Discrep	*t*	RO
Determination of					
1. School's total program.	3.88	3.21	0.67	5.41*	6
2. Detailed content of the school's program.	3.11	2.71	0.40	3.87*	10
3. Texts and instructional material for subjects.	2.91	2.59	0.32	2.51	12
4. The way a subject is presented in class.	1.90	1.80	0.10	0.94	15
5. Frequency and methods of classroom testing.	2.06	1.87	0.19	2.11	13
6. Friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	1.93	1.81	0.12	1.12	14
7. Size and composition of classes.	4.09	2.80	1.29	6.64*	1
8. Grading and promotion of students.	3.22	2.70	0.52	4.31*	8
9. Allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	4.09	3.00	1.09	7.31*	3
10. Teaching load and other duties of teachers.	4.24	3.04	1.20	8.05*	2
11. Arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling.	3.20	2.82	0.38	2.95*	11
12. School rules/regulations for general student body.	3.71	3.21	0.50	4.19*	9
13. Nature of organized professional development activities.	3.50	2.88	0.62	6.00*	7
14. How teachers are to be evaluated.	3.96	2.90	1.06	6.04*	4
15. Expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	4.15	3.10	1.05	7.45*	5

*Significant beyond the .01 level.
RO=Rank order based on size of discrepancy.

Senior High School Level

Table 6.7 shows the discrepancy between the mean perceived and the mean preferred involvement scores of the individual teacher in determining action for each task at the senior high school. Significant differences between the mean perceived and the mean preferred involvement scores occurred regarding all tasks except the three tasks (Tasks 4, 5, and 6) in the area of classroom management. On the other hand, the tasks that received the five largest discrepancy scores were as follows: (1) Task 7 (the size and composition of classes), (2) Task 10 (the teaching load and other duties of teachers), (3) Task 14 (how teachers are to be evaluated), and (4) Task 15 (the expenditure patterns of school-based budgets), and (5) Task 9 (the allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment).

Table 6.8 presents the degree of discrepancy in the involvement of the staff group for each task. There were significant differences in the mean perceived and preferred involvement scores regarding all tasks except two, both (Tasks 5, and 6) in the area of classroom management. In contrast, the five tasks showing the largest discrepancy scores were as follows: (1) Task 7 (the composition of classes), (2) Task 10 (the teaching load and other duties of teachers), (3) Task 14 (how teachers are to be evaluated), (4) Task 1 (the school's total program), and (5) Task 15 (the expenditure patterns of school-based budgets).

TABLE 6.7

Discrepancy between Mean Perceived and Preferred Involvement Scores of the Individual Teacher Determining Action for Each Task (Senior High School)
(N=149)

Tasks	Actual	Pref	Discrep	*t*	RO
Determination of					
1. School's total program.	2.11	3.16	-1.05	-12.80*	6
2. Detailed content of the school's program.	2.44	3.31	-0.87	-10.21*	7
3. Texts and instructional material for subjects.	3.01	3.83	-0.82	-9.13*	9
4. The way a subject is presented in class.	4.54	4.56	-0.02	-0.67	14
5. Frequency and methods of classroom testing.	4.23	4.30	-0.07	-1.18	13
6. Friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	4.47	4.48	-0.01	-0.29	15
7. Size and composition of classes.	1.75	3.74	-1.99	-19.76*	1
8. Grading and promotion of students.	3.92	4.29	-0.37	-5.53*	12
9. Allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	2.34	3.51	-1.17	-13.60*	5
10. Teaching load and other duties of teachers.	2.03	3.55	-1.52	-14.89*	2
11. Arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling.	3.14	3.76	-0.62	-7.52*	10
12. School rules/regulations for general student body.	2.56	3.43	-0.87	-9.91*	7
13. Nature of organized professional development activities.	3.27	3.76	-0.49	-5.96*	11
14. How teachers are to be evaluated.	2.40	3.87	-1.47	-14.49*	3
15. Expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	2.29	3.48	-1.19	-13.93*	4

*Significant beyond the .01 level.
RO=Rank order based on size of discrepancy.

TABLE 6.8

Discrepancy between Mean Perceived and Preferred Involvement Scores of the Staff Group in Determining Action for Each Task (Senior High School)
(N=149)

Tasks	Actual	Pref	Discrep	*t*	RO
Determination of					
1. School's total program.	2.77	3.74	-0.97	-11.41*	4
2. Detailed content of the school's program.	2.70	3.54	-0.84	-10.39*	6
3. Texts and instructional material for subjects.	2.94	3.52	-0.58	-6.94*	9
4. The way a subject is presented in class.	2.61	2.81	-0.20	-3.82*	13
5. Frequency and methods of classroom testing.	2.91	3.07	-0.16	-2.55	14
6. Friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	2.42	2.55	-0.13	-2.52	15
7. Size and composition of classes.	2.12	3.68	-1.57	-14.26*	1
8. Grading and promotion of students.	3.03	3.42	-0.39	-5.40*	12
9. Allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	2.87	3.69	-0.82	-10.05*	8
10. Teaching load and other duties of teachers.	2.33	3.50	-1.17	-11.92*	2
11. Arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling.	2.75	3.23	-0.48	-6.12*	10
12. School rules/regulations for general student body.	3.02	3.86	-0.84	-10.58*	6
13. Nature of organized professional development activities.	3.57	3.97	-0.40	-5.81*	11
14. How teachers are to be evaluated.	2.81	3.92	-1.11	-10.25*	3
15. Expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	2.87	3.81	-0.94	-10.52*	5

*Significant beyond the .01 level.
RO=Rank order based on size of discrepancy.

Table 6.9 indicates discrepancy scores of the higher official authority regarding each task. There were significant differences between the mean perceived and preferred involvement scores of the higher official authority with respect to all tasks except the three tasks of classroom management. On the other hand, the five tasks indicating the largest positive discrepancy scores were as follows: (1) Task 7 (the size and composition of classes), (2) Task 10 (the teaching load and other duties of teachers), (3) Task 14 (how teachers are to be evaluated), and (4) Task 9 (the allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equiment), and (5) Task 15 (the expenditure patterns of school-based budgets).

Summary

In the area of classroom management, no decisional deprivation was found in most cases for both the individual teacher and the formal staff group at the three levels of schools. On the other hand, a relatively large decisional deprivation of the individual teacher and the formal staff group was identified regarding most tasks outside classroom management, particularly for tasks related to (1) teacher evaluation, (2) composition of classes, (3) teaching load and other duties of teachers, and (4) resource allocation. In contrast, regarding these tasks mentioned above, the higher official authority was actually involved far more than was preferred by teachers.

TABLE 6.9

Discrepancy between Mean Perceived and Preferred Involvement Scores of the Higher Authority in Determining Action for Each Task (Senior High School)
(N=149)

Tasks	Actual	Pref	Discrep	*t*	RO
Determination of					
1. School's total program.	4.23	3.55	0.68	7.59*	6
2. Detailed content of the school's program.	3.48	2.99	0.49	5.53*	8
3. Texts and instructional material for subjects.	3.05	2.68	0.37	3.68*	11
4. The way a subject is presented in class.	1.82	1.74	0.08	1.01	15
5. Frequency and methods of classroom testing.	2.16	2.04	0.12	1.45	13
6. Friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	1.94	2.04	-0.10	-1.25	14
7. Size and composition of classes.	4.35	3.01	1.34	14.49*	1
8. Grading and promotion of students.	2.91	2.53	0.38	3.86*	10
9. Allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	4.08	3.17	0.91	9.83*	4
10. Teaching load and other duties of teachers.	4.31	3.06	1.25	13.36*	2
11. Arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling.	3.48	3.06	0.42	5.85*	9
12. School rules/regulation for general student body.	4.03	3.38	0.65	7.86*	7
13. Nature of organized professional development activities.	3.26	2.89	0.37	3.99*	11
14. How teachers are to be evaluated.	4.10	2.99	1.11	10.54*	3
15. Expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	4.21	3.36	0.85	9.12*	5

*Significant beyond the .01 level.
RO=Rank order based on size of discrepancy.

Differences in Degrees of Discrepancy by Type of School

Research Question 3.2: What significant differences exist in degrees of discrepancy among the three types of schools regarding the involvement of each decision-making unit for each task?

In order to investigate the question, the mean discrepancy score of each decision-making unit with respect to each task was calculated for each group of teachers categorized by type of school. The one-way analysis of variance, ANOVA, was used to test for significant differences among the mean discrepancy scores of the teacher groups regarding each task.

The Individual Teacher as Decision-Making Unit

As shown in Table 6.10, there were no significant differences in the mean discrepancy scores of the three types of schools regarding the involvement of the individual teacher for all tasks except three. That is, the discrepancy score of the individual teacher was significantly higher at the elementary school than at the junior and senior high school for Task 5 (frequency and methods of classroom testing). For Task 8 (the grading and promotion of students), the discrepancy score was significantly higher at the elementary and the junior high school than at the senior high school. For Task 13 (the nature of organized professional development activities), the discrepancy score was significantly higher at the

TABLE 6.10

Comparison of Mean Discrepancy Scores in Involvement
of the Individual Teacher Determining Action
for Each Task by Type of School
(N=298)

Tasks	1.Elem n=66	2.JHS n=83	3.SHS n=149	F	Diff
Determination of					
1. School's total program.	-0.87	-1.12	-1.05	1.33	
2. Detailed content of the school program.	-0.80	-0.89	-0.87	0.16	
3. Texts and instructional material for subjects.	-0.66	-0.84	-0.82	0.59	
4. The way a subject is presented in class.	-0.09	-0.20	-0.02	2.30	
5. Frequency and methods of classroom testing.	-0.60	-0.19	-0.07	8.41**	1-2 1-3
6. Friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	-0.08	-0.11	-0.01	0.79	
7. Size and composition of classes.	-1.81	-2.26	-1.99	2.42	
8. Grading and promotion of students.	-0.77	-0.83	-0.37	7.43**	1-3 2-3
9. Allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	-1.10	-1.26	-1.17	0.37	
10. Teaching load and other duties of teachers.	-1.26	-1.44	-1.52	0.92	
11. Arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling.	-0.72	-0.79	-0.62	0.67	
12. School rules/regulations for general student body.	-0.80	-0.78	-0.87	0.21	
13. Nature of organized professional development activities.	-0.96	-0.59	-0.49	4.21*	1-3
14. How teachers are to be evaluated.	-1.49	-1.54	-1.47	0.07	
15. Expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	-1.03	-1.26	-1.19	0.72	

*$p<.05$, **$p<.01$

elementary school than at the senior high school.

The Formal Staff Group as Decision-Making Unit

As indicated in Table 6.11, significant differences were found in the mean discrepancy scores of the three types of schools regarding the involvement of the formal staff group for five tasks: the three tasks (Tasks 4, 5, and 6) in the area of classroom management and two tasks (Tasks 8 and 13) outside classroom management. The discrepancy scores of the formal staff group were significantly higher at the junior high school than at the elementary school for Tasks 4 and 6, and also significantly higher than at the senior high school for Tasks 6 and 13. For Task 5, the discrepancy score was significantly higher at the elementary school than at both the junior and senior high schools. Another aspect of the data indicated higher discrepancy scores for the elementary and junior high schools for task 8 (the grading and promotion of students), as compared with that of the senior high school.

The Higher Official Authority as Decision-Making Unit

As shown in Table 6.12, there were no significant differences in the discrepancy scores of the three types of schools regarding the involvement of the higher official authority for all three tasks in the area of classroom management. However, significant differences in the mean discrepancy scores were found regarding six tasks outside

TABLE 6.11

Comparison of Mean Discrepancy Scores in Involvement
of the Staff Group in Determining Action
for Each Task by Type of School
(N=298)

Tasks	1.Elem n=66	2.JHS n=83	3.SHS n=149	F	Diff
Determination of					
1. School's total program.	-0.83	-1.09	-0.97	1.08	
2. Detailed content of the school's program.	-0.71	-0.79	-0.84	0.38	
3. Texts and instructional material for subjects.	-0.77	-0.82	-0.58	1.56	
4. The way a subject is presented in class.	-0.11	-0.42	-0.20	3.63*	1-2
5. Frequency and methods of classroom testing.	-0.73	-0.23	-0.16	8.11**	1-2 1-3
6. Friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	-0.16	-0.43	-0.13	4.78**	1-2 2-3
7. Size and composition of classes.	-1.49	-1.83	-1.57	1.39	
8. Grading and promotion of students.	-0.74	-0.80	-0.39	5.75**	1-3 2-3
9. Allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	-0.90	-1.17	-0.82	2.89	
10. Teaching load and other duties of teachers.	-1.22	-1.43	-1.17	1.27	
11. Arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling.	-0.54	-0.77	-0.48	2.21	
12. School rules/regulations for general student body.	-0.75	-0.92	-0.84	0.52	
13. Nature of organized professional development activities.	-0.61	-0.75	-0.40	3.54*	2-3
14. How teachers are to be evaluated.	-1.50	-1.48	-1.11	2.63	
15. Expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	-1.06	-1.26	-0.94	2.02	

$*p<.05$, $**p<.01$

TABLE 6.12

Comparison of Mean Discrepancy Scores in Involvement
of the Higher Authority in Determining Action
for Each Task by Type of School
(N=298)

Tasks	1.Elem n=66	2.JHS n=83	3.SHS n=149	F	Diff
Determination of					
1. School's total program.	0.28	0.67	0.68	3.30*	1-3
2. Detailed content of the school's program.	-0.06	0.40	0.49	7.09**	1-2 1-3
3. Texts and instructional material for subjects.	0.22	0.32	0.37	0.37	
4. The way a subject is presented in class.	-0.14	0.10	0.08	1.66	
5. Frequency and methods of classroom testing.	0.39	0.19	0.12	1.78	
6. Friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	-0.27	0.12	-0.10	2.94	
7. Size and composition of classes.	0.92	1.29	1.34	2.20	
8. Grading and promotion of students.	0.33	0.52	0.38	0.65	
9. Allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	0.48	1.09	0.91	4.64*	1-2 1-3
10. Teaching load and other duties of teachers.	0.81	1.20	1.25	3.19*	1-3
11. Arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling.	0.15	0.38	0.42	1.98	
12. School rules/regulations for general student body	-0.11	0.50	0.65	12.96**	1-2 1-3
13. Nature of organized professional development activities.	0.61	0.62	0.37	2.06	
14. How teachers are to be evaluated.	0.49	1.06	1.11	4.61*	1-2 1-3
15. Expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	0.59	1.05	0.85	2.79	

*$p<.05$, **$p<.01$

classroom management. The discrepancy scores of the higher official authority were significanlty lower at the elementary school than at the junior and senior high schools for four tasks: Task 2 (the detailed content of the school's program), Task 9 (the allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment), Task 12 (school rules and regulations for the general student body), and Task 14 (how teachers are to be evaluated). For Task 1 (the school's total program) and Task 10 (the teaching load and other duties of teachers), the discrepancy scores were also significantly lower at the elementary school than at the senior high school.

Summary

The degree of decisional deprivation of the individual teacher was significantly higher at the elementary school than at the junior high school for one task on classroom testing, and also significantly higher than at the senior high school for three tasks: (1) classroom testing , (2) the grading and promotion of students, and (3) professional development activities. For one task on the grading and promotion of students, the degree of decisional deprivation of the individual teacher was significantly higher at the junior high school than at the senior high school.

The degree of decisional deprivation of the formal staff group was significantly higher at the elementary school than at the junior high school for one task on classroom testing, and also significantly higher than at the senior high school for two tasks: one task on classroom testing and the other task on grading and promotion of students. On the other hand, the degree of decisional deprivation was significantly higher at the junior high school than at the elementary school for two tasks in the area of classroom management, and also significantly higher than at the senior high school for three tasks: one task concerning classroom management and two tasks outside classroom management.

The degree of discrepancy in the perceived and the preferred involvement of the higher official authority was significantly lower at the elementary school than at the junior and senior high schools for four tasks outside classroom management, and also significantly lower at the elementary school than at the senior high school for two more tasks outside classroom management.

It is noteworthy that, first, in no case was the degree of deprivation of both the individual teacher and the formal staff group significantly higher at the senior high school than at the elementary and junior high schools. Second, the degree of discrepancy between the perceived and the preferred involvement of the higher official authority was significantly lower at the elementary school than at the junior and senior high schools for several tasks external to classroom management.

Differences in Degrees of Discrepancy by Demographic Variables

In this section, analyses were conducted to determine whether there were any significant differences in the mean discrepancy scores of teacher groups categorized by demographic variables with respect to each task.

Male and Female

Research Question 3.3: What significant differences exist in degrees of discrepancy between male and female staff regarding the involvement of each decision-making unit for each task?

Table 6.13 shows the mean discrepancy scores by sex. No significant differences in discrepancy scores of male and female staff occurred regarding the involvement of the three decision-making units for all 45 cases except for 4 cases. Female staff had significantly higher discrepancy scores than male staff in (1) the involvement of the individual teacher for Task 13 (the nature of organized professional development activities) and (2) the involvement of the formal staff for Task 5 (the frequency and methods of classroom testing). On the other hand, male staff desired significantly lower involvement of the higher official authority than female staff with respect to Task 2 (the detailed content of the school's program) and Task 6 (the friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships).

TABLE 6.13

Comparison of Mean Discrepancy Scores in Involvement of Each Decision-Making Unit in Determining Action for Each Task by Sex
(N=298)

Task No.	**Individual Teacher**			**Staff Group**			**Higher Authority**		
	M n=156	**F** n=142	*t*	**M** n=156	**F** n=142	*t*	**M** n=156	**F** n=142	*t*
1.	-1.05	-1.01	-0.28	-0.86	-1.09	1.95	0.67	0.49	1.34
2.	-0.86	-0.86	0.00	-0.74	-0.86	0.98	0.48	0.19	2.45*
3.	-0.86	-0.74	-0.87	-0.72	-0.66	-0.44	0.36	0.27	0.62
4.	-0.14	-0.04	-1.55	-0.22	-0.27	0.53	0.12	-0.07	1.81
5.	-0.16	-0.30	1.27	-0.18	-0.46	2.39*	0.29	0.11	1.52
6.	-0.11	-0.00	-1.58	-0.21	-0.24	0.31	0.03	-0.21	2.05*
7.	-1.97	-2.06	0.63	-1.52	-1.72	1.25	1.30	1.13	1.05
8.	-0.54	-0.64	0.96	-0.50	-0.66	1.31	0.52	0.28	1.80
9.	-1.24	-1.11	-1.02	-0.88	-1.00	0.99	0.93	0.78	1.02
10.	-1.41	-1.46	0.32	-1.13	-1.38	1.74	1.17	1.09	0.60
11.	-0.59	-0.78	1.52	-0.49	-0.66	1.37	0.36	0.33	0.30
12.	-0.75	-0.89	1.21	-0.78	-0.90	0.93	0.55	0.32	1.81
13.	-0.49	-0.75	2.11*	-0.49	-0.59	0.86	0.47	0.52	-0.45
14.	-1.41	-1.57	1.00	-1.16	-1.43	1.64	0.97	0.92	0.29
15.	-1.17	-1.16	-0.03	-1.05	-1.08	0.25	0.89	0.80	0.63

M=Male, F=Female
*$p < .05$

Length of Teaching Experience

Research Question 3.4: What significant differences exist in degrees of discrepancy among teacher groups categorized by length of teaching experience regarding the involvement of each decision-making unit for each task?

As indicated in Table 6.14, there were significant differences in discrepancy scores of the perceived and preferred involvement of the individual teacher regarding six tasks: one task in the area of classroom management and five tasks outside clasroom management. First, the decisional deprivation scores were significantly higher for teachers with the shortest length of teaching experience (5 years or less) than for teachers with the longest length of teaching experience (11 years or more) with respect to Task 1 (the school's total program), Task 2 (the detailed content of the school's program), and Task 5 (frequency and methods of classroom testing). Second, the decisional deprivation scores were significantly lower for teachers with the longest length of teaching experience than for the two other groups of teachers regarding Task 7 (the size and composition of classes) and Task 10 (the teaching load and other duties of teachers). Third, the decisional deprivation score was significantly higher for teachers with a medium length of teaching experience (6-10 years) than for teachers with the longest length of teaching experience regarding Task 11 (arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling).

TABLE 6.14

Comparison of Mean Discrepancy Scores in Involvement of the Individual Teacher in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Teaching Experience
(N=298)

Task No.	1. 5 years or less n=41	2. 6-10 years n=66	3. 11 years or more n=191	F	Difference
1.	-1.41	-1.05	-0.94	4.15*	1-3
2.	-1.17	-1.00	-0.74	3.90*	1-3
3.	-0.90	-0.92	-0.73	0.91	
4.	-0.00	-0.20	-0.07	1.89	
5.	-0.49	-0.38	-0.12	4.16*	1-3
6.	-0.13	-0.16	-0.54	0.46	
7.	-2.34	-2.37	-1.82	6.57**	1-3, 2-3
8.	-0.54	-0.77	-0.53	1.54	
9.	-1.49	-1.11	-1.13	1.83	
10.	-1.71	-1.85	-1.23	6.98**	1-3, 2-3
11.	-0.63	-0.98	-0.59	3.36*	2-3
12.	-0.98	-0.79	-0.79	0.53	
13.	-0.78	-0.68	-0.56	0.86	
14.	-1.37	-1.59	-1.48	0.36	
15.	-1.39	-1.26	-1.09	1.39	

Length of Teaching Experience: columns 1–3.

*$p<.05$, **$p<.01$

As presented in Table 6.15, significant differences in the decisional deprivation scores of the formal staff group occurred with regard to six tasks: one task concerning classroom management and five tasks external to classroom management. First, the higher decisional deprivation scores were found for teachers with the shortest teaching experience than for teachers with the longest teaching experience with respect to Task 1 (the school's total program), Task 2 (the detailed content of the school's program), and Task 15 (the expenditure patterns of school-based budgets). Second, the decisional deprivation scores were significantly higher for teachers with a medium length of teaching experience than for teachers with the longest length of teaching experience regarding Task 5 (frequency and methods of classroom testing), Task 10 (the teaching load and other duties of teachers), and Task 12 (school rules and regulations for the general student body).

Table 6.16 shows the discrepancy between the perceived and preferred involvement of the higher official authority. The discrepancy scores were significantly different regarding five tasks outside classroom management. First, the discrepancy scores were higher for teachers with the shortest length of teaching experience than for teachers with the longest length of teaching experience regarding Task 7 (the size and composition of classes), Task 9 (allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and

TABLE 6.15

Comparison of Mean Discrepancy Scores in Involvement of the Staff Group in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Teaching Experience
(N=298)

	Length of Teaching Experience				
Task No.	1. 5 years or less n=41	2. 6-10 years n=66	3. 11 years or more n=191	F	Difference
1.	-1.24	-1.13	-0.86	3.27*	1-3
2.	-1.10	-0.89	-0.70	3.07*	1-3
3.	-0.73	-0.80	-0.65	0.49	
4.	-0.45	-0.21	-0.21	1.90	
5.	-0.43	-0.55	-0.21	3.28*	2-3
6.	-0.33	-0.11	-0.24	1.18	
7.	-1.95	-1.81	-1.48	2.87	
8.	-0.68	-0.77	-0.49	2.05	
9.	-1.13	-1.05	-0.86	1.51	
10.	-1.43	-1.55	-1.11	3.72*	2-3
11.	-0.50	-0.79	-0.51	1.82	
12.	-0.90	-1.15	-0.72	4.30*	2-3
13.	-0.65	-0.75	-0.44	2.65	
14.	-1.03	-1.54	-1.26	1.73	
15.	-1.40	-1.20	-0.94	3.08*	1-3

*$p<.05$

TABLE 6.16

Comparison of Mean Discrepancy Scores in Involvement of the Higher Authority in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Teaching Experience (N=298)

Task No.	Length of Teaching Experience 1. 5 years or less n=41	2. 6-10 years n=66	3. 11 years or more n=191	F	Difference
1.	0.75	0.68	0.51	1.07	
2.	0.56	0.51	0.23	2.98	
3.	0.35	0.45	0.27	0.58	
4.	0.20	0.05	0.01	0.95	
5.	0.33	0.09	0.22	0.73	
6.	-0.00	-0.09	-0.10	0.18	
7.	1.65	1.34	1.08	3.21*	1-3
8.	0.48	0.40	0.39	0.10	
9.	1.30	0.97	0.72	4.21*	1-3
10.	1.45	1.42	0.96	5.34**	1-3, 2-3
11.	0.48	0.52	0.25	2.44	
12.	0.90	0.60	0.28	7.01**	1-3
13.	0.73	0.60	0.40	2.03	
14.	0.98	1.08	0.90	0.41	
15.	1.25	1.08	0.67	5.79**	1-3, 2-3

$^*p<.05$, $^{**}p<.01$

equipment), and Task 12 (the rules and regulations for the general student body). Second, the discrepancy scores were lower for teachers with the longest length of teaching experience than for the two other teacher groups with regard to Task 10 (the teaching load and other duties of teachers) and Task 15 (the expenditure patterns of school-based budgets).

Length of Training

Research Question 3.5: What significant differences exist in degrees of discrepancy among teacher groups categorized by length of training regarding the involvement of each decision-making unit for each task?

As seen in Tables 6.17, 6.18, and 6.19, there were no significant differences among the mean discrepancy scores of teacher groups classified by length of training, regarding all cases except one. That is, the decisional deprivation of the individual teacher was significantly lower for teachers with the longest period of training (six years or more) than for the two other teacher groups with respect to one task in the area of classroom management as indicated in Table 6.17. There were no significant differences in the discrepancy scores among the teacher groups regarding the involvement of the staff group and the higher authority for all tasks as shown in Tables 6.18 and 6.19.

Summary

No significant differences in degrees of discrepancy between male and female staff regarding the involvement of

TABLE 6.17

Comparison of Mean Discrepancy Scores in Involvement of the Individual Teacher in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Training (N=295)

	Length of Training				
Task No.	1. Four years n=119	2. Five years n=100	3. Six years or more n=76	F	Difference
1.	-1.16	-0.92	-0.99	1.80	
2.	-1.01	-0.75	-0.76	2.21	
3.	-0.75	-0.92	-0.75	0.76	
4.	-0.15	-0.08	0.01	2.00	
5.	-0.32	-0.21	-0.09	1.47	
6.	-0.15	-0.07	0.12	5.29**	1-3, 2-3
7.	-2.13	-1.97	-1.92	0.76	
8.	-0.61	-0.57	-0.56	0.06	
9.	-1.25	-1.21	-1.01	1.08	
10.	-1.60	-1.24	-1.42	2.14	
11.	-0.83	-0.58	-0.58	1.90	
12.	-0.87	-0.81	-0.78	0.18	
13.	-0.70	-0.48	-0.68	1.20	
14.	-1.54	-1.39	-1.54	0.41	
15.	-1.15	-1.17	-1.20	0.03	

*$p<.05$, **$p<.01$

TABLE 6.18

Comparison of Mean Discrepancy Scores in Involvement of the Staff Group in Determining Action for Each Task by Length of Training (N=295)

	Length of Training				
Task No.	1. Four years n=119	2. Five years n=100	3. Six years or more n=76	F	Difference
1.	-1.01	-0.96	-0.91	0.22	
2.	-0.91	-0.71	-0.69	1.50	
3.	-0.74	-0.70	-0.65	0.15	
4.	-0.25	-0.31	-0.15	0.98	
5.	-0.46	-0.28	-0.12	2.86	
6.	-0.27	-0.27	-0.09	1.63	
7.	-1.77	-1.57	-1.43	1.45	
8.	-0.63	-0.57	-0.53	0.21	
9.	-0.97	-1.04	-0.74	1.76	
10.	-1.37	-1.27	-1.01	2.00	
11.	-0.57	-0.61	-0.53	0.11	
12.	-0.80	-0.88	-0.86	0.15	
13.	-0.56	-0.55	-0.52	0.03	
14.	-1.48	-1.26	-1.03	2.35	
15.	-1.12	-1.07	-0.97	0.35	

$*p<.05$

TABLE 6.19

Comparison of Mean Dicrepancy Scores in Involvement
of the Higher Authority in Determining Action
for Each Task by Length of Training
(N=295)

	Length of Training				
Task No.	1. Four years n=119	2. Five years n=100	3. Six years or more n=76	F	Difference
1.	0.48	0.61	0.73	1.20	
2.	0.28	0.39	0.40	0.46	
3.	0.30	0.34	0.35	0.05	
4.	0.51	0.00	0.07	0.15	
5.	0.21	0.17	0.26	0.17	
6.	-0.05	-0.15	-0.07	0.27	
7.	1.31	1.16	1.17	0.37	
8.	0.43	0.32	0.50	0.57	
9.	0.97	0.73	0.86	1.08	
10.	1.23	1.07	1.07	0.61	
11.	0.40	0.37	0.23	0.76	
12.	0.43	0.58	0.29	1.67	
13.	0.61	0.36	0.50	1.43	
14.	0.97	0.94	0.94	0.02	
15.	0.91	0.80	0.84	0.21	

*$p<.05$

the three decision-making units for most cases.

Teachers with ten years or less teaching experience indicated higher degree of deprivation of the individual teacher in decision-making involvement with respect to eight cases out of the 45 as compared with teachers with eleven years or more teaching experience. Similarly, teachers with shorter length of teaching experience showed higher deprivation of the formal staff group regarding six cases out of the 45 in comparison with teachers with longer teaching experience. In addition, the degree of discrepancy of the higher official authority was higher for teachers with shorter length of teaching experience regarding seven cases out of 45 cases, as compared with teachers with longer teaching experience.

There was no significant difference in degrees of discrepancy among teachers classified by length of training regarding the involvement of the three decision-making units for 135 cases except for one.

Percentages with Low and High Discrepancy in Decision-Making Involvement

Research Question 3.6: What are the percentages with low and high discrepancy in the involvement of each decision-making unit for each task?

In order to examine the question, the distribution of discrepancy scores of each decision-making unit regarding each task was computed for each teacher group categorized by type of school. The discrepancy scores ranged from -4 to

+4. The scores which ranged from -1 to +1 were regarded as no or low degree of discrepancy, and those scores less than -1 or greater than +1 were considered as high degree of discrepancy. The percentages for no or low degree of discrepancy and high degree of discrepancy in the involvement of each decision-making unit were calculated for each task, as provided in Tables 6.20, 6.21, and 6.22.

Elementary School Level

As seen in Table 6.20, at the elementary school, two tasks in the area of classroom management received the highest percentage with no or low degree of discrepancy in the involvement of the individual teacher. These were Task 4 (98.5%) and Task 6 (98.4%). However, Task 5 dealing with classroom testing showed 72.8%. On the other hand, the three tasks indicating the largest percentage with high degree of discrepancy were as follows: Task 7 (58.5%) on composition of classes, Task 14 (46.0%) on teacher evaluation, and Task 10 (40.0%) on teaching load and other duties of teachers.

The Tasks showing the largest percentage with no or low degree of discrepancy in the involvement of the formal staff group were similar to those of the indidiual teacher. These were Task 4 (96.8%) and Task 6 (93.6%). In contrast, the tasks that received the largest percentage with high degree of discrepancy were as follows: Task 14 (50.9%), Task 7 (42.9%), and Task 10 (34.9%).

TABLE 6.20

Percentage with Low and High Discrepancy in Involvement of Each Decision-Making Unit for Each Task (Elementary School) (N=66)

Task No.	Individual Teacher no or low (%)	Individual Teacher high (%)	Staff Group no or low (%)	Staff Group high (%)	Higher Authority no or low (%)	Higher Authority high (%)
1.	77.3	22.7	75.0	25.0	81.3	18.7
2.	76.9	23.1	82.5	17.5	84.4	15.6
3.	80.0	20.0	79.0	21.0	82.8	17.2
4.	98.5	1.5	96.8	3.2	90.7	9.3
5.	72.8	27.2	73.0	27.0	77.7	22.3
6.	98.4	1.6	93.6	6.4	87.3	12.7
7.	41.5	58.5	57.1	42.9	61.0	39.0
8.	79.4	20.6	77.1	22.9	78.2	21.8
9.	69.2	30.8	76.2	23.8	73.4	26.6
10.	60.0	40.0	65.1	34.9	74.6	25.4
11.	77.0	23.0	82.5	17.5	92.0	8.0
12.	75.8	24.2	76.6	23.4	87.5	12.5
13.	69.7	30.3	76.5	23.5	82.8	17.2
14.	54.0	46.0	49.1	50.9	70.4	29.6
15.	69.2	30.8	63.5	36.5	76.2	23.8

No or low discrepancy=discrepancy scores which ranged from -1 to +1.
High discrepancy=discrepancy scores which are less than -1 and greater than +1.

TABLE 6.21

Percentage with Low and High Discrepancy in
Involvement of Each Decision-Making Unit
for Each Task (Junior high School)
(N=84)

Task No.	Individual Teacher		Staff Group		Higher Authority	
	no or low (%)	high (%)	no or low (%)	high (%)	no or low (%)	high (%)
1.	59.5	40.5	56.6	43.4	73.2	26.8
2.	70.2	29.8	72.3	27.7	82.9	17.1
3.	71.4	28.6	72.0	28.0	74.4	25.6
4.	92.8	7.2	91.5	8.5	86.6	13.4
5.	92.8	7.2	90.4	9.6	89.1	10.9
6.	95.2	4.8	86.6	13.4	90.1	9.9
7.	24.1	75.9	36.1	63.9	33.4	66.6
8.	73.8	26.2	77.1	22.9	80.4	19.6
9.	61.4	38.6	56.6	43.4	53.7	46.3
10.	51.2	48.8	56.6	43.4	52.4	47.6
11.	72.9	27.1	75.9	24.1	84.1	15.9
12.	81.0	19.0	71.1	28.9	76.8	23.2
13.	82.1	17.9	75.9	24.1	78.1	21.9
14.	41.9	58.1	48.1	51.9	56.9	43.1
15.	57.1	42.9	60.2	39.8	57.3	42.7

No or low discrepancy=discrepancy scores which ranged from -1 to +1.

High discrepancy=discrepancy scores which are less than -1 and greater than +1.

TABLE 6.22

Percentage with Low and High Discrepancy in Involvement of Each Decision-Making Unit for Each Task (Senior High School)
(N=149)

Task No.	Individual Teacher		Staff Group		Higher Authority	
	no or low (%)	high (%)	no or low (%)	high (%)	no or low (%)	high (%)
1.	68.2	31.8	71.2	28.8	80.9	19.1
2.	74.3	25.7	76.2	23.8	84.2	15.8
3.	75.7	24.3	81.4	18.6	83.5	16.5
4.	97.3	2.7	93.1	6.9	92.9	7.1
5.	92.5	7.5	93.2	6.8	89.4	10.6
6.	95.8	4.2	94.5	5.5	90.8	9.2
7.	32.9	67.1	44.1	55.9	51.8	48.2
8.	91.8	8.2	89.1	10.9	84.3	15.7
9.	64.9	35.1	77.9	22.1	75.0	25.0
10.	55.4	44.6	67.3	32.7	60.7	39.3
11.	83.8	16.2	86.2	13.8	90.8	9.2
12.	73.5	26.5	73.3	26.7	80.9	19.1
13.	83.8	16.2	88.3	11.7	83.0	17.0
14.	54.1	45.9	61.6	38.4	65.3	34.7
15.	63.9	36.1	76.0	24.0	75.2	24.8

No or low discrepancy=discrepancy scores which ranged from -1 to +1.
High discrepancy=discrepancy scores which are less than -1 and greater than +1.

The tasks that received the largest percentage with no or low degree of discrepancy in the involvement of the higher official authority were Task 4 (90.7%) and Task 6 (87.3%) dealing with classroom management, and Task 11 (92.0%) concerning arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling. On the other hand, the three tasks showing the largest percentage with high degree of discrepancy were as follows: Task 7 (39.0%), Task 14 (29.6%), and Task 9 (26.6%). Task 5 (22.3%) for classroom testing also indicated a relatively large percentage with high degree of discrepancy.

Junior High School Level

As presented in Table 6.21, at the junior high school, all three tasks in the area of classroom management received the largest percentage with no or low degree of discrepancy in the involvement of both the individual teacher and the formal staff group: Task 4 (92.8%, 91.5%), Task 5 (92.8%, 90.4%), and Task 6 (95.2%, 86.6%). On the other hand, the tasks showing the largest percentage with high degree of discrepancy in the involvement of both the individual teacher and the formal staff group were as follows: Task 1 (40.5%, 43.4%), Task 7 (75.9%, 63.9%), Task 10 (48.8%, 43.4%), and Task 14 (58.1%, 51.9%).

The three tasks concerning classroom management showed the largest percentage with no or low degree of discrepancy in the involvement of the higher official authority: Task 4

(86.6%), Task 5 (89.1%), and Task 6 (90.1%). On the other hand, the three tasks indicating the largest percentage with high degree of discrepancy in the involvement of the higher official authority were as follows: Task 7 (66.6%), Task 10 (47.6%), and Task 14 (43.1%).

Senior High School Level

As shown in Table 6.22, at the senior high school, the three tasks concerning classroom management indicated the largest percentage with no or low degree of discrepancy in the involvement of both the individual teacher and the formal staff group: Task 4 (97.3%, 93.1%), Task 5 (92.5%, 93.2%), and Task 6 (95.8%, 94.5%). In contrast, the tasks showing the largest percentage with high degree of discrepancy in the involvement of both the individual teacher and the formal staff group were as follows: Task 7 (67.1%, 55.9%), Task 10 (44.6%, 32.7%), and Task 14 (45.9%, 38.4%).

Regarding the involvement of the higher official authority, the four tasks (three tasks in the area of classroom management and one task outside classroom management) received the largest percentage with no or low degree of discrepancy: Task 4 (92.9%), Task 5 (89.4%), Task 6 (90.8%), and Task 11 (90.8%). On the other hand, the three tasks indicating the largest percentage with high degree of discrepancy in the involvement of the the higher official authority were as follows: Task 7 (48.2%), Task 10

(39.3%), and Task 14 (34.7%).

Summary

At the elementary school level, two tasks in the area of classroom management received the largest percentage with no or low degree of discrepancy regarding the involvement of each of the three decision-making units. On the other hand, the tasks indicating the largest percentage with high degree of discrepancy were three tasks outside classroom management: (1) composition of classes, (2) teaching load and other duties of teachers, and (3) teacher evaluation.

At the junior and senior high school levels, the three tasks in the area of classroom management received the largest percentage with no or low degree of discrepancy in the involvement of each of the three decision-making units. In contrast, the three tasks showing the largest percentage with high degree of discrepancy were the same tasks indicated at the elementary school level.

Summary and Discussion

This chapter dealt with findings on (1) the discrepancy between the perceived and the preferred involvement of each decision-making unit for each task, (2) differences in degrees of discrepancy by type of school, sex, length of teaching experience, and length of training of the teachers, and (3) the percentages with low and high discrepancy regarding the involvement of each decision-making unit for each task.

In the area of classroom management, a low discrepancy was found regarding the involvement of each of the three decision-making units. On the other hand, a relatively high degree of decisional deprivation of both the individual teacher and the formal staff group was identified concerning most tasks outside classroom management, particularly tasks concerning (1) teacher evaluation, (2) composition of classes, (3) teaching load and other duties of teachers, and (4) resource allocation. In contrast, for those tasks other than classroom management mentioned above, the higher official authority was actually involved more than was preferred by teachers. Similar results were observed regarding the percentages with low and high discrepancy in the involvement of each of the three decision-making units for the fifteen tasks.

The findings suggested that teachers did not wish much change in the present distribution of decision-making authority with respect to matters concerning classroom management. However, they desired some changes in the distribution of decision-making authority with respect to school matters outside classroom management. The findings showed the characteristics of prefessional bureaucracy observed by Mintzberg (1979:358):

> The Professional Bureaucracy is a highly democratic structure, at least, for the professionals of the operating core. In fact, not only do the professionals control their own work, but also seek collective control of the administrative decisions that affect them.

The findings also indicated a tension between professional authority and administrative authority as observed by a number of writers such as Corwin (1965), Alutto and Belasco (1973), Chamberlain (1975), Hoy and Miskel (1978:69-79), and Hasenfeld (1983:163-164).

The degrees of discrepancy of each of the three decision-making units regarding the fifteen tasks were largely similar in the three types of schools. However, some differences were found in comparison by type of school. The degree of deprivation of teachers was significantly higher at the elementary and junior high school levels than at the senior high school level with respect to a few tasks. These were (1) classroom testing, (2) grading and promotion of students, and (3) professional development activities. On the other hand, the degree of discrepancy between the perceived and the preferred involvement of the higher official authority was significantly lower at the elementary school level than at the junior and senior high school levels for several tasks external to classroom management.

No significant differences in the degree of discrepancy between male and female staff were found regarding most tasks. Second, some significant differences in degrees of discrepancy were found among teachers categorized by length of teaching experience. Teachers with less than 11 years of teaching experience showed higher degrees of deprivation in the involvement of both the individual teacher and the formal staff group for some tasks, and also observed higher degrees of involvement of the higher official authority for some tasks, as compared with teachers with 11 years or more teaching experience. Finally, there was no significant difference in degrees of discrepancy regarding the involvement of each of the three decision-making units for the fifteen tasks among teachers categorized by length of training.

In conclusion, teachers did not desire much change in the current distribution of discretionary power over classroom matters, whereas they wished some changes in that of discretionary power over administrative matters. The results were similar to those which would be implied by the characteristics of professional bureaucracy. The results also indicated a tension between professional authority and administrative authority.

CHAPTER 7

SATISFACTION OF TEACHERS WITH THEIR INVOLVEMENT IN DECISION MAKING

This chapter deals with findings on overall satisfaction levels of teachers with their involvement in decision making and differences in the satisfaction levels by type of school, sex, length of teaching experience, and length of training of the teachers. Analyses were also carried out to determine the relationship between overall satisfaction of teachers with their involvement in decision making and decisional deprivation of teachers with respect to each task. In addition, major sources of overall dissatisfaction of teachers with their involvement in decision making were analyzed.

Overall Satisfaction Level of Teachers with Their Involvement in Decision Making

Research Question 4.1: What degree of satisfaction do teachers feel with their involvement in decision making?

The scale of overall satisfaction of teachers with their involvement in decision making ranged from 1 to 6: 1 (very dissatisfied), 2 (moderately dissatisfied), 3 (slightly dissatisfied), 4 (slightly satisfied), 5 (moderately satisfied), and 6 (very satisfied).

As shown in Tables 7.1 to 7.4, the mean score of

TABLE 7.1

Comparison of Mean Satisfaction Scores of Teachers with Their Involvement in Decision Making by Type of School

	Type of School			
	1.Elem n=66	**2.JHS** n=83	**3.SHS** n=142	**Difference**
Mean satisfaction score	4.30	3.86	4.39	2-3

F=4.23, *p*<.05

TABLE 7.2

Comparison of Mean Satisfaction Scores of Teachers with Their Involvement in Decision Making by Sex

	Male n=151	**Female** n=139
Mean satisfaction score	4.28	4.16

t=0.78, *p*>.05

TABLE 7.3

Comparison of Mean Satisfaction Scores of Teachers
with Their Involvement in Decision Making
by Length of Teaching Experience

	Length of Teaching Experience 1. 5 years or less n=40	2. 6-10 years n=64	3. 11 years or more n=186	Diff
Mean satisfaction score	3.85	3.95	4.40	1-3 2-3

$F=4.26$, $p<.05$

TABLE 7.4

Comparison of Mean Satisfaction Scores of Teachers
with Their Involvement in Decision Making
by Length of Training

	Length of Training 1. Four years n=118	2. Five years n=96	3. Six years or more n=73	Diff
Mean satisfaction score	4.13	4.13	4.48	

$F=1.78$, $p>.05$

teacher satisfaction with their involvement in decision making was calculated for each teacher group categorized by the demographic variables. The mean score represents overall satisfaction level of teachers with their involvement in decision making.

Overall Satisfaction Levels of Teachers

As seen in Tables 7.1 to 7.4, the mean overall satisfaction scores of teachers with their involvement in decision making fell between 3.85 and 4.48 which indicates that teachers were, in general, slightly satisfied with their involvement. However, for the entire sample of teachers, the distribution of the scores ranged from very dissatisfied to very satisfied with their involvement. Specifically, 3.4% of teachers were very dissatisfied, 12.1% of teachers were moderately dissatisfied, 14.1% of teachers were slightly dissatisfied, 14.8% of teachers were slightly satisfied, 40.0% of teachers were moderately satisfied, and 15.5% of teachers were very satisfied. This shows that even though teachers in general were slightly satisfied, 29.6% of teachers were somewhat dissatisfied and 70.3% of teachers were relatively satisfied with their involvement in decision making.

Research Question 4.2: What significant differences exist in overall satisfaction levels of teachers with their involvement in decision making by type of school, sex, length of teaching experience, and length of training of the teachers?

Difference by Type of School

Table 7.1 shows the comparison of the mean satisfaction scores of teachers with their involvement in decision making by type of school. The mean satisfaction score of teachers in the senior high school was significantly higher than that of the junior high school, but it was not significantly different from the mean score of teachers in the elementary school.

Difference by Male and Female

Table 7.2 presents the comparison of the mean satisfaction scores of male and female staff. The mean satisfaction score of female staff was not significantly different from that of male staff.

Difference by Length of Teaching Experience

As seen in Table 7.3, teachers with 11 years or more teaching experience showed a significantly higher satisfaction score than teachers with less than 11 years of teaching,experience.

Difference by Length of Training

As shown in Table 7.4, there was no significant difference in satisfaction scores among teachers categorized by length of training of the teachers.

Summary

The mean overall satisfaction scores of teachers with their involvement in decision making indicate that teachers, in general, were slightly satisfied with their involvement in decision making. However, 29.6% of teachers were somewhat dissatisfied and 70.3% of teachers were relatively satisfied with their involvement in decision making. Second, the satisfaction score of teachers was significantly higher at the senior high school level than at the junior high school level, but not significantly different from the elementary school level. Third, there was no signifcant difference in the satisfaction scores of male and female staff. Fourth, teachers with 11 years or more teaching experience showed significantly higher satisfaction score than that of teachers with 10 years or less teaching experience. Finally, there was no significant difference in the satisfaction scores of teachers categorized by length of training.

Relationship between Overall Satisfaction and Decisional Deprivation

Research Question 4.3: What relationship exists between overall satisfaction of teachers with their involvement in decision making and decisional deprivation of teachers regarding each task?

In order to examine the question, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients between overall satisfaction of teachers with their involvement in decision making and decisional deprivation of teachers regarding the fifteen tasks were computed for each teacher group categorized by type of school, as seen in Table 7.5.

Negative correlation coefficients between overall satisfaction of teachers and decisional deprivation of

TABLE 7.5

Correlation Coefficients between Overall Satisfaction of Teachers and Decisional Deprivation of Teachers for Each Task by Type of School
(N=298)

Tasks	Overall satisfaction Elem n=66	 JHS n=83	 SHS n=149
Determination of			
1. School's total program.	-.31	-.43*	-.52*
2. Detailed content of the school's program.	-.33*	-.46*	-.39*
3. Texts and instructional material for subjects.	-.46*	-.17	-.26*
4. The way a subject is presented in class.	-.15	-.22	-.10
5. Frequency and methods of classroom testing.	-.19	-.22	-.17
6. Friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	-.29	-.06	-.01
7. Size and composition of classes.	-.47*	-.38*	-.36*
8. Grading and promotion of students.	-.42*	-.31*	-.24*
9. Allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	-.53*	-.43*	-.47*
10. Teaching load and other duties of teachers.	-.53*	-.34*	-.33*
11. Arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling.	-.40*	-.20	-.18
12. School rules/regulations for general student body.	-.37*	-.42*	-.31*
13. Nature of organized professional development activities.	-.57*	-.27	-.27*
14. How teachers are to be evaluated.	-.48*	-.25	-.35*
15. Expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	-.60*	-.36*	-.39*

*Significant beyond the .01 level.

teachers occurred for all tasks. No significant coefficients were found regarding the three tasks in the area of classroom management, whereas significant coefficients were identified for most tasks external to classroom management. At the elementary school level, the following tasks indicated high correlation coefficients: (1) the expenditure patterns of school-based budgets (-.60), (2) nature of organized professional development activities (-.57), (3) allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment (-.53), and (4) teaching load and other duties of teachers (-.53). At the junior high school level, the tasks which showed high coefficients were as follows: (1) detailed content of the school's program (-.46), (2) school's total program (-.43), (3) allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment (-.43), and (4) school rules and regulations for the general student body (-.42). At the senior high school level, the following tasks showed high coefficients: (1) school's total program (-.52), (2) allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment (-.47), (3) detailed content of the school's program (-.39), and (4) the expenditure patterns of school-based budgets (-.39).

In summary, negative relationships occurred between overall satisfaction level of teachers and decisional deprivation of teachers regarding all tasks. For the tasks of classroom management, no significant relationships were found, while significant relationships were identified regarding most tasks outside classroom management. At the elementary school level, high relationships were observed regarding the following tasks: (1) resource allocation, (2) professional development activities, and (3) teaching load and other duties of teachers. At the secondary school level, high relatioships were identified for the following tasks: (1) the school's program and (2) resource allocation.

Major Sources of Overall Dissatisfaction of Teachers

Research Question 4.4: What are major sources of overall dissatisfaction of teachers with their involvement in decision making?

In order to identify major sources of overall dissatisfaction of teachers with their involvement in decision making, multiple regression analysis was conducted with satisfaction with decision making as criterion and decisional deprivation scores as predictors as summarized in Tables 7.6 to 7.8.

As seen in Table 7.6, at the elementary school level, the task on professional development activities accounted for 39 percent of variance, followed by the task dealing with expenditure patterns of school-based budgets (15%), and the task dealing with teaching load and other duties of teachers (4%). The three tasks accounted for 58 percent of variance. At the junior high school level as shown in

TABLE 7.6

Multiple Regression Analysis with Satisfaction with Decision Making as Criterion and Decisional Deprivation Scores as Predictors (Elementary School)
(N=66)

Tasks	R^2	Increase in R^2	r
Determination of			
13. Nature of organized professional development activities.	.389		-.57
15. Expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	.536	.147	-.60
10. Teaching load and other duties of teachers.	.577	.041	-.53

TABLE 7.7

Multiple Regression Analysis with Satisfaction with Decision Making as Criterion and Decisional Deprivation Scores as Predictors (Junior High School)
(N=83)

Tasks	R^2	**Increase in** R^2	r
Determination of			
2. Detailed content of the school's program.	.190		-.46
9. Allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	.249	.059	-.43

TABLE 7.8

Multiple Regression Analysis with Satisfaction with Decision Making as Criterion and Decisional Deprivation Scores as Predictors (Senior High School)
(N=149)

Tasks	R^2	Increase in R^2	r
Determination of			
1. School's total program.	.295		-.52
9. Allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	.358	.063	-.47

Table 7.7, the task regarding detailed content of the school's program accounted for 19 percent of variance,* followed by the task regarding allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment (6%). Both tasks accounted for 25 percent of variance. At the senior high school level as presented in Table 7.8, the task on the school's total program accounted for 30 percent of variance, followed by the task on allocation of money to teachers for instructional aids and equipment (6%). The two tasks accounted for 36 percent of variance.

Free Responses

On the topic of "sharing responsibilities for decision-making in education," 52 teachers out of 298 provided their opinions. Content analysis of the free responses was carried out by two categories: the positive attitude and the negative attitude of teachers toward participation in decision making. The criteria of the positive attitude included such expressions as (1) satisfaction with one's involvement, (2) willingness of more involvement in decision making, and (3) positive evaluation of participation. On the other hand, the criteria of negative attitude included such expressions as (1) dissatisfaction with one's involvement, (2) unwillingness of participation, and (3) negative evaluation of participation. According to content analysis of the free responses with the criteria, 69.2% of teachers showed a positive attitude, while 26.9% of teachers indicated a negative attitude. The responses of 3.6% of teachers were not applicable.

Summary and Discussion

This chapter presented findings on (1) overall satisfaction levels of teachers with their involvement in decision making, (2) differences in the satisfaction levels by demographic variables, (3) the relationship between satisfaction level of teachers and decisional deprivation of teachers, and (4) major sources of overall dissatisfaction with their involvement in decision making.

The mean overall satisfaction scores of teacher groups with their involvement in decision making ranged from 3.85 to 4.48 which indicates that teachers in general were slightly satisfied with their involvement. However, for the entire sample of teachers, the distribution of the scores ranged from very dissatisfied to very satisfied with their involvement. Generally, 70.3% of teachers were relatively satisfied, while 29.6% of teachers were somewhat dissatisfied with their involvement in decision making. The findings are almost identical with the result of the analysis of free responses: 69.2% of teachers showed positive attitudes and 26.9% of teachers indicated negative attitudes toward participation in decision making.

No significant difference was found in satisfaction levels of teachers with their involvement in decision making by teachers categorized by sex and length of training. However, significant difference was found among teachers classified by type of school and length of teaching experience. That is, the satisfaction level of the teachers in the senior high school was significantly higher than that of the teachers in the junior high school, but not significantly different from that of the teachers in the elementary school. Second, teachers with 11 years or more teaching experience showed a significantly higher level of satisfaction than teachers with 10 or fewer year teaching experience.

Negative relationships existed between the overall satisfaction level of teachers and the decisional deprivation of teachers regarding all tasks. For the tasks of classroom management, no significant relationships were found, while significant relationships were identified regarding most tasks outside classroom management. At the elementary school level, high negative relationships were observed regarding the following tasks: (1) resource allocation, (2) professional development activities, and (3) teaching load and other duties of teachers. At the secondary school level, high negative relationships were identified for the tasks concerning (1) the school's program and (2) resource allocation.

The findings suggested that teachers were not dissatisfied with their involvement in decision making in the area of classroom management, but that they were somewhat dissatisfied with their involvement in resolving most school matters outside classroom management, particularly those tasks mentioned above. In comparison with the data presented in the previous chapter, it was recognized that, in general, the greater decisional deprivation teachers felt, the higher dissatisfaction they evidenced. In other words, an inverse relationship was found between the overall satisfaction of teachers with their involvement in decision making and the degree of decisional deprivation of teachers. The results of studies conducted by Alluto and Belasco (1973), Conway (1976), and Holdaway (1978) showed that teacher involvement in decision making is related to job satisfaction. Accordingly, satisfaction of teachers with their involvement in decision making can be considered to be related to job satisfaction.

Major sources of overall dissatisfaction of teachers were identified regarding their involvement in decision making. At the elementary school level, major sources were (1) professional development activities, (2) resource allocation, and (3) teaching load and other duties of teachers. At the junior and senior high school levels, the major sources were (1) the school's program planning and (2) resource allocation.

In conclusion, the degree of decisional deprivation of teachers is inversely related to their overall satisfaction with decision-making involvement. In other words, the greater the decisional deprivation of teachers, the lower their job satisfaction. In this respect, teachers were not dissatisfied with matters concerning classroom management, but they were somewhat dissatisfied with school matters outside classroom management.

CHAPTER 8

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary of the Study

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the distribution of decision-making authority as perceived and preferred by teachers in elementary, junior high, and senior high schools in Edmonton, Alberta. The distribution was examined by the perceived relative degree of involvement of the individual teacher, the formal staff group, and the higher official authority in determining action for fifteen tasks which are associated with the operation of the instructional program. This study was also designed to examine (1) the discrepancy between the perceived and preferred involvement of each of the three decision-making units for each task, (2) the overall satisfaction of teachers with their involvement in decision making, (3) the relationship between the overall satisfaction of teachers and decisional deprivation of teachers for each task, and (4) the major sources of dissatisfaction of teachers with their involvement in decision making.

Theoretical Basis

The formal organization is a collectivity designed to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the efforts of human beings in order to accomplish specific goals. Its efficiency and effectiveness are thought to be partly determined by the degree to which the individuals participate in various tasks of the organization. The manner of participation is formally determined by the structure of the organization. An essential element of the structure is authority.

Simon (1961:125), Baum (1961:26), and Rogers (1975:167) regarded authority as legitimate power to make decisions which control the behavior of others toward accomplishing organizational goals. Hasenfeld (1983:161) argued that the distribution of authority in formal organizations is basically hierarchical, but the dynamics of authority cannot be viewed solely as operating through the hierarchy.

Etzioni (1964:76) and Mintzberg (1979:351) suggested that authority structures in organizations employing professionals are characterized by the mixture of two basic types of authority: (1) administrative authority based on a hierarchy and (2) professional authority derived from knowledge and expertise. Administrative authority is supposed to be exercised by rank, while professional authority is supposed to be exercised by individual professionals or groups of professionals. Authority structures vary depending upon the degree of professionalization of members. According to Etzioni

(1964:75-93) and Scott (1981:222-223), in full-fledged professional organizations, professionals have substantial authority in defining and implementing goals. In semi-professional organizations, professionals have considerable authority over task decisions regarding means or techniques. Thus, professional authority is based on the degree of expertise and ability of professionals to control the conditions of their work and to gain autonomy from administrative authority.

In schools, the distribution of authority is generally characterized by the relative degree of administrative authority and professional authority regarding task activities. Further, it is suggested that highly bureaucratic authority may be ineffective in accomplishing educational goals. Therefore, an appropriate balance between administrative and professional authority in order to meet the needs of the organization and the needs of individuals is seen as important.

Decision making is described as a rational process of choice or judgment. Steers (1977:159) considered participative decision making as an attempt to decentralize authority throughout an organization. Simpkins and Friesen (1969), Rogers (1975:174), and Schein (1980:64-70) contended that organizations function more effectively when decisions are made with the active participation of personnel close to the point of implementation.

Since the distribution of decision-making authority is assumed to be closely associated with the productivity of organizations, the satisfaction of members, the stability and flexibility of organizations, it is a matter of continuing importance to determine the distribution of decision-making authority in schools. The distribution can be examined by the relative degree of involvement at the three levels--the individual teacher, the staff group, and the administrators--in determining action regarding important tasks.

Research Methodology

In order to carry out this study, the researcher modified and augmented the questionnaire developed by Simpkins (1968). The modified questionnaire consisted of the personal information section and five parts: (1) three parts designed to measure the perceived and preferred degree of involvement of each of the three decision-making units for fifteen tasks in schools by using a five-point scale which ranged from very low involvement to very high involvement, (2) the fourth part designed to obtain free expressions of opinion from respondents on the topic of sharing responsibilities for decision making in education, and (3) the final part designed to measure the degree of overall satisfaction level of teachers with their involvement in decision making by using a six-point scale which ranged from very dissatisfied to very satisfied.

The data of the study were collected by using the questionnaire. The questionnaire was sent to all 580 teachers in the selected fifteen schools. The total number of returns was 308 (53.0%), from which 298 (51.3%) were accepted for analysis. The caution must be exercised in interpreting data because of the low return rate of questionnaires.

The data were analyzed in order to examine these aspects: (1) the perceived and preferred distribution of decision-making authority regarding the fifteen tasks, (2) the degree of discrepancy between the perceived and the preferred involvement of each of the three decision-making units regarding each of the fifteen tasks, (3) the differences in degrees of the involvement and the discrepancy by demographic variables, (4) the overall satisfaction level of teachers with their involvement in decision making, (5) the relationship between overall satisfaction of teachers and decisional deprivation of teachers for each task, and (6) the major sources of dissatisfaction of teachers with their participation in decision making.

Findings of the Study

Perceptions

Research question Number 1: What is the distribution of decision-making authority perceived by teachers in their schools?

1. The individual teacher was seen by teachers in the three types of schools to have a major role in determining action regarding all tasks in the area of classroom management.
2. For some tasks such as (1) selection of texts and instructional material, (2) grading and promotion of students, and (3) arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling, there was a tendency for the individual teacher to be more involved in determining action, compared with other tasks beyond those related to classroom management.
3. The higher official authority was perceived to have a major role in determining action regarding a majority of tasks outside of classroom management, particularly regarding tasks concerning (1) total school's program, (2) resource allocation, (3) teaching load and other duties of teachers, and (4) class size and composition, and (5) teacher evaluation.
4. The formal staff group was perceived to have a leading role in determining action concerning only one of the fifteen tasks, that of the nature of organized professional development activities.

Research Question Number 2: What significant differences exist in the involvement of each decision-making unit in determining action for each of the fifteen tasks in the perceptions of teachers categorized by type of school, sex, length of teaching experience, and length of training?

1. The involvement patterns of the three decision-making

units were similar in the three types of schools. However, teachers in the elementary school tended to be more involved in resolving matters external to classroom management than those in the junior and senior high schools.

2. In the perceptions of teachers categorized by sex, length of teaching experience, and length of training, little difference was found regarding the degree of the involvement of the three decision-making units for most tasks.

Preferences

Research Question Number 3: What is the distribution of decision-making authority preferred by teachers in their schools?

1. Teachers in the three types of schools preferred the individual teacher to maintain a major role in deciding matters of classroom management and also to extend to a few more tasks closely associated with classroom management: (1) texts and instructional material for subjects, (2) the grading and promotion of students, and (3) arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling.
2. Teachers preferred the formal staff group to have a leading role in determining action regarding a majority of tasks outside classroom management.
3. Teachers preferred higher involvement of both the formal staff group and the higher official authority in

deciding the school's total program.

4. Teachers desired the lower involvement of the higher authority in determining action concerning most tasks.

Research Question Number 4: What significant differences exist in the involvement of each decision-making unit in determining action for each of the fifteen tasks in the preferences of teachers categorized by type of school, sex, length of teaching experience, and length of training?

1. The preferred involvement patterns of the three decision-making units for the fifteen tasks were largely similar in the three types of schools. However, teachers in the senior high school tended to prefer the individual teacher to be less involved in deciding some matters outside classroom management than those in the elementary and junior high schools.
2. In the preferences of teachers categorized by length of teaching experience and length of training, little difference was found regarding their involvement in decision making.

Discrepancy

Research Question Number 5: What degree of discrepancy exists between the perceived and the preferred involvement of each of the three decision-making units regarding each of the fifteen tasks in their schools?

1. A low decisional deprivation of teachers was found in the area of classroom managemet.
2. A relatively high degree of decisional deprivation of teachers was identified regarding most tasks outside classroom management, paticularly regarding tasks

concerning (1) teacher evaluation, (2) composition of classes, (3) teaching load and other duties of teachers, and (4) resource allocation.

3. The higher official authority was involved to a greater degree than was preferred by teachers for those tasks mentioned above.

Research Question Number 6: What significant differences exist in degrees of discrepancy among teacher groups categorized by type of school, sex, length of teaching experience, and length of training regarding the involvement of each decision-making unit for each task?

1. The degree of discrepancy of each of the three decision-making units regarding each task was largely similar in the three types of schools. However, the degree of decisional deprivation of both the individual teacher and the staff group was significantly higher at the elementary school level with respect to a few tasks: (1) classroom testing, (2) grading and promotion of students, and (3) professional development activities. On the other hand, the degree of discrepancy between the perceived and preferred involvement of the higher offical authority was significantly lower at the elementary school level than at the junior and senior high school levels for several tasks external to classroom management.
2. No significant difference was found in the degrees of discrepancy by teacher groups classified by sex and length of training. However, some significant

differences occurred in degrees of discrepancy among teachers categorized by length of teaching experience. Teachers with less than 11 years of teaching experience showed a higher degree of deprivation in the involvement of both the individual teacher and the staff group for some tasks, and also showed a higher degree of involvement of the higher official authority for some tasks, as compared with teachers with 11 years or more teaching experience.

Satisfaction

Research Question Number 7: What degree of satisfaction do teachers feel with their involvement in decision making?

1. The mean overall satisfaction scores of teacher groups with their involvement in decision making fell between 3.85 and 4.48 which indicates that teachers were, in general, slightly satisfied with their involvement.
2. However, for the entire sample of teachers, the distribution of the scores ranged from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 6 (very satisfied). Specifically, 3.4% of teachers were very dissatisfied, 12.1% of teachers were moderately dissatisfied, 14.1% of teachers were slightly dissatisfied, 14.8% of teachers were slightly satisfied, 40.0% of teachers were moderately satisfied, and 15.5% of teachers were very satisified. This shows that 29.6% of teachers were somewhat dissatisfied, while 70.3% of teachers were relatively satisfied with their

involvement in decision making.

Research Question Number 8: What significant differences exist in overall satisfaction levels of teachers with their involvement in decision making by type of school, sex, length of teaching experience, and length of training of the teachers?

1. No significant differences were found in overall satisfaction levels of teachers categorized by sex and length of training.
2. Significant differences were found among teachers classified by type of school and length of teaching experience. The mean score (4.39) of overall satisfaction of teachers in the senior high school was significantly higher than the score (3.86) of the teachers in the junior high school, but not significantly different from the score (4.30) of the teachers in the elementary school. The mean satisfaction score (4.40) of teachers with 11 years or more teaching experience was significantly higher than the score (3.95) of those with 10 years or less teaching experience.

Research Question Number 9: What relationship exists between overall satisfaction of teachers with their involvement in decision making and decisional deprivation of teachers regarding each task?

1. A negative relationship existed between overall satisfaction of teachers and decisional deprivation of teachers regarding all tasks. For the tasks in the area of classroom management, no significant relationship was

found, while negative significant relationships between satisfaction and decisional deprivation were identified for most tasks outside classroom management.

2. At the elementary school level, high negative relationships between satisfaction and decisional deprivation were observed for the following tasks: (1) resource allocation, (2) professional development activities, and (3) teaching load and other duties of teachers.
3. At the junior and senior high school levels, high negative relationships were identified for the tasks concerning (1) the school's total program, and (2) resource allocation.

Research Question Number 10: What are major sources of overall dissatisfaction of teachers with their involvement in decision making?

1. At the elementary school level, the best predictors of overall dissatisfaction of teachers with decision making were (1) professional development activities and (2) resource allocation, and (3) teaching load and other duties of teachers.
2. At the junior and senior high school levels, the best predictors were (1) the school's program planning and (2) resource allocation.

Free Responses

The free responses showed 69.2% of teachers had a positive attitude toward participation in decision making, while 26.9% of teachers had a negative attitude. The responses of 3.6% of teachers were not applicable. This is almost identical with the findings that 70.3% of teachers were satisfied with their involvement in decision making and 29.6% of teachers were dissatisfied with their involvement.

Conclusions and Discussion

On the basis of the findings of this study, certain conclusions can be drawn. These conclusions are discussed in light of existing literature and research findings.

The Distribution of Decision-Making Authority

Perceptions. Teacher autonomy was evident with respect to tasks in the area of classroom management, whereas hierarchical control was pervasive in matters outside classroom management. Collegial control was weak regarding most tasks. However, there was a tendency for teachers to expand their influence on determining action for a few more tasks closer to classroom management such as (1) selection of texts and instructional material, (2) grading and promotion of students, and (3) arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling, as compared with the results of the Simpkins's study (1968) which were presented in Chapter 2. The findings generally agreed with the literature and research on the formal authority structure of the school organization. Simpkins and Friesen (1969) noted that individual teachers played the major role in determining action for the tasks concerning classroom management, while administrators played the leading role in resolving administrative matters, and the staff group played the minor role in decision making regarding all tasks. Meyer and Rowan (1978:78) posited that instruction tends to be removed from both bureaucratic and collegial controls, whereas bureaucratic controls are relatively tight on administrative matters. Lortie (1969:9) argued that "within buildings, students and teachers are distributed into separate rooms. Such self-contained classrooms are small universes of control with the teacher in command." In addition, the teacher deals with students who have diverse backgrounds and needs. Thus, individuality is stressed rather than uniformity through hierarchical or collegial control.

Preferences. Teachers preferred to maintain a substantial degree of autonomy within the boundary of the classroom and also preferred to extend their autonomy to a few more tasks closely related to classroom instruction such as (1) selection of texts and instructional material, (2) grading and promotion of students, and (3) arrangements for parents to discuss their children's schooling. Second, teachers preferred somewhat greater collegial control with respect to a majority of tasks beyond the boundary of the classroom. Third, teachers preferred both collegial control and hierarchical control regarding the school's total program. The findings are generally consistent with the results of the Simpkins's study presented in Chapter 2. A number of studies concerning the preferences of teachers in decision-making involvement suggested two different positions. Some studies asserted that teachers wanted to be involved in decision making with respect to the area of instruction. Other studies suggested that teachers desired to be involved in decision making regarding administrative matters as well as instructional matters. For example, Whannell (1976) and Crockenberg and Clark (1978) indicated that instructional area of decisions was located inside the teachers' zone of concern and administrative area of decisions was located outside the teachers' zone of concern. On the other hand, Chamberlain (1975) and Isherwood and Taylor (1978) indicated that the teachers' zone of concern was extending to the area of administrative decisions. Owens (1970:103) concluded that "teachers are increasingly demanding greater professional autonomy and authority in the making of decisions regarding instruction and curriculum and freedom from bureaucratic domination."

The findings of this study suggested that teachers tended to prefer to exercise more discretionary power regarding administrative matters. However, it is a matter for further research whether teachers really desired greater discretionary power in certain administrative areas or whether such desire of teachers is associated with dissatisfaction with decisions made in those areas. It may be that this greater desire for involvement is indicative of speicific problem areas.

Teacher Professionalization. The degree of professionalization of members of an organization can be assessed in light of numerous criteria as suggested by Etzioni (1964), Hoy and Miskel (1978), and Scott (1981). The following two criteria can be considered to be important: (1) the degree of autonomy in professional decision making and (2) the degree of collegial control over organizational goals and means. In the light of these criteria, the findings of this study suggested that a higher degree of professionalization was seen in the preferences of teachers for the distribution of decision-making authority than in the perceptions. The characteristics of the formal authority preferred by teachers in schools were very close to those of the full-fledged professional organization.

Decisional Deprivation

Decisional deprivation of teachers was found to be low in tasks in the area of classroom management. On the other hand, a relatively high degree of decisional deprivation of teachers was identified concerning most tasks outside classroom management. The data indicated the characteristics of professional bureaucracy observed by Mintzberg (1979:358) who noted that the professionals at the operating level control their own work but also seek collective control of the administrative area of decisions which affect their work.

The findings also indicated a tension between professional authority and administrative authority as observed by Corwin (1965), Alutto and Belasco (1973), Chamberlain (1975), Hoy and Miskel (1978:69-79), and Hasenfeld (1983:163-164). For instance, Corwin (1965:1) contended that "there is a consistent pattern of conflict between teachers and school administrators over the control of work."

However, teachers with longer teaching experience showed less decisional deprivation than those with shorter teaching experience. The finding may reflect that senior teachers are probably more socialized and that they are also more involved in decision making than the more junior teachers.

Teacher Satisfaction

About 70% of teachers were satisfied with their overall involvement in decision making, while about 30% of teachers were dissatisfied with their involvement.

Regarding tasks of classroom management, no significant negative relationship was found between the overall satisfaction of teachers with their involvement in decision making and the decisional deprivation of teachers. But a significant negative relationship was identified regarding most tasks outside classroom management. It was also found that the degree of decisional deprivation of teachers was inversely related to their overall satisfaction level with decision-making involvement.

Alutto and Belasco (1973), Conway (1976), and Holdaway (1978) indicated that teacher involvement in decision making is related to job satisfaction. Logically, it can be said that satisfaction of teachers with their decision-making involvement is associated with their job satisfaction. On this basis, it can be interpreted that teachers were not dissatisfied with matters concerning classroom management, but they were somewhat dissatisfied with school matters external to classroom management.

In general, teachers wished a considerable change in the distribution of decision-making authority in schools. They wanted differentiated involvement of the individual teacher, the staff group, and the administrator, depending upon the nature of the tasks. However, they tended to prefer greater teacher autonomy and collegial control over most school matters outside classoom management and somewhat less hierarchical control.

Implications

For Theory

The results of this study provide information which may serve to clarify some concepts of authority structure, teacher professionalization, decisional deprivation of teachers, and teacher satisfaction with their involvement in decision making.

Authority structure in schools. Authority structure in school organizations is complex with a mixture of teacher autonomy, collegial control, and hierarchical control. Individual teachers have a substantial degree of autonomy regarding matters of instruction in the classroom. Those in the chain of command control most administrative matters beyond the boundary of the classroom. The staff group does not have much discretionary power over most task activities.

The authority structure preferred by teachers is somewhat different from the existing structure. Teachers tended to prefer greater autonomy and collegial control over most tasks external to classroom management. This suggests that the zone of concern of teachers is not limited to the area of instructional decisions, but extends to matters of decisions in other areas of organizational life as well.

Teacher professionalization. Even if teacher autonomy is substantial in the area of classroom management, the goals of the school organization and basic working conditions are determined by those in the chain of command. However, teachers tended to prefer greater autonomy and collegial control over most of those matters. In this sense, the image of full-fledged professionals of teachers is reflected in their preferences. Lortie (1969:30-31) stated that "it appears that considerable militancy and knowledge-building must occur if teachers are to acquire the work arrangements and technical apparatus associated with high-prestige professions."

There is little evidence of change in the authority structure and teacher professionalization except that teachers tend to expand their autonomy to a few more tasks closely associated with the area of instruction, as compared with the results of the Simpkins's study in 1968.

Decisional deprivation and teacher satisfaction.

Decisional deprivation was found to be low in tasks in the area of classroom management, whereas a relatively high decisional deprivation was identified in other areas. The overall satisfaction of teachers with their involvement in decision making was inversely related to the degree of decisional deprivation of teachers. A number of studies have indicated that the involvement of subordinates is related to their job satisfaction. Thus, it can be said that teachers are relatively satisfied with their major work, but they are somewhat dissatisfied with school matters external to classroom management. However, about 70% of teachers are relatively satisfied with their overall school life.

For Practice

Schein (1980:248-252) emphasized four conditions for organizational effectiveness: good communication, flexibility, creativity, and psychological commitment. Schein (1980:252) noted that

> These conditions are to be obtained by (1) recruitment, selection, and socialization practices that stimulate rather than demean people; (2) more realistic psychological relationships based on a more realistic psychological contract and the recognition of developmental changes in people; (3) more effective group action; (4) perpetual redesign of organization structures; and (5) better leadership in terms of the activities of goal setting and value definition.

The distribution of decision-making authority is assumed to be closely associated with the efficiency and effectiveness of the organization. In this respect, some implications for practice are presented mainly according to the five points indicated above.

Socialization practices. The results of this study show that a considerable discrepancy existed between the current and the desired involvement of the individual teacher, the staff group, and administrators. To help decrease this discrepancy, participatory decision making seems further desired. Owens (1981:312) regarded participation as "the mental and emotional involvement of a person in a group situation that encourages the individual to group goals and to share responsibility for them." Thus, such participation is related to better quality of work life of teachers which may lead to better performance of students. Practices of participatory decision making themselves are considered as one approach to socialization of the members of an organization, and to higher job satisfaction.

Psychological relationship. The findings on the degree of discrepancy and the level of overall satisfaction of teachers indicate that the psychological relationship between teachers and administrators should be further considered for the effectiveness of schools. Thus, participation in decision making should be emphasized because an appropriate participation is associated with psychological rewards. According to Schein (1980:250),

> it [the organization] cannot obtain commitment, creativity, and flexibility simply by handing out a larger paycheck; there must be the possibility of obtaining non-economic rewards such as autonomy, genuine responsibility, and opportunities for challenge and psychological growth.

Effective group action. The findings show that teachers preferred the staff group to be more active in decision making. In professional organizations, autonomy and collegial control seems more desired than hierarchical control. Alutto and Belasco (1972), Cox and Wood (1980), and Hoy and Sousa (1984) indicated that rigid hierarchical control is related to dissatisfaction, militancy, and alienation of teachers. Thus, group action should be more effective by practices of participatory decision making. Schein (1980:250) contended that "if employees feel threatened, demeaned, and unappreciated, they will form together into antimanagement groups." These findigs may also suggest that teachers desire to extend their sphere of influence as professionals, thereby gaining greater control over their own work.

Redesign of organizational structure. The results indicate that there was an incongruence between the current and the desired distribution of decision-making authority in schools. It is worth considering modification of the authority structure so as to be more appropriate for the accommodation of the needs of teachers and the needs of school organizations. For example, the structure may be modified by organizing and utilizing various committees in dealing with school matters which affect the work of teachers.

Better leadership. As the findings of this study indicate, teachers preferred the differential involvement of the individual teacher, the staff group, and the administrator in decision making according to the nature of the task concerned. The principal as the leader of a school needs to identify the specific needs of teachers and to accommodate them to the extent possible, depending on the nature of the task in the particular situation. In this regard, a flexible leadership style on the part of the principal seems desired. According to Hersey and Blanchard (1977:101),

> the more managers adapt their style of leader behavior to meet the particular situation and the needs of their followers, the more effective they will tend to be in reaching personal and organizational goals.

Ethical consideration. The value associated with shared decision making corresponds to workplace democracy because the value is based on respect for the dignity, cooperative efforts, mutuality, self-discipline, and self-actualization of individuals. Imber (1983:39) emphasized workplace democracy as follows:

> It holds that the fact that workers agree to exchange their labor for remuneration does not in itself justify the assumption by their superiors of total control of that labor. In this view, workers, despite their agreement to participate in an organized process of production, cannot be treated purely as means to an end. They retain the right to collaborate on decisions which relate to the utilization of their labor.

Constraints. Extending teacher participation in decision making, even though generally seen as a positive move, has to be examined also in the context within which teachers work. Whether teachers have the time, the expertise and the interest to be involved are important questions for consideration, as is the question of accountability.

For Further Research

It is recommended that:

1. Research methodology be further improved with a

consideration of including interview and observational approaches in order to improve the validity and reliability of the study.

2. A study similar to this be conducted with a sample of administrators. Comparison with and integration of the findings of the studies would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the topic.
3. The number of tasks in the instrument be expanded to include some tasks concerning personnel and community relations in order to expand the comprehensiveness of the results of this study.
4. Opinions of teachers and administrators be sought by presenting the results of this study to them for their reactions in order to have some additional insights regarding the distribution of decision-making authority in schools.

The studies recommended above would provide more comprehensive and valid information on the distribution of decision-making authority. Such information would contribute to further clarifying the concept of authority structure in school organizations as well as improving the authority structure so as to better meet the needs of a particular situation.

Concluding Statement

The core task of schools--instruction--is actually controlled by individual teachers. Consequently, the quality of school education greatly depends on the quality and effort of individual teachers. The basic role of administrators is to arrange appropriate conditions for instruction as well as to assist teachers to improve their instruction. In this regard, the quality of preservice and inservice education for both teachers and administrators is crucial for the improvement of school education.

However, the effectiveness of school organizations will be improved by (1) motivating teachers to participate actively in their work, (2) having them experience emotional and intellectual satisfaction, and (3) developing good relationships between the principal and teachers. In this respect, school organizations need to be more professional and less bureaucratic.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alutto, Joseph A., and James A. Belasco. "A Typology for Participation in Organizational Decision Making." Administrative Science Quarterly, 17 (1972), 117-125.

Alutto, J.A., and J.A. Belasco. "Patterns of Teacher Participation in School System Decision-Making." Educational Administration Quarterly, 9 (1973), 27-41.

Anderson, Henry Norman. "An Empirical Study of Authoritarianism, Bureaucratic Role Orientations, and Perceptions of Positional Authority in School Organizations." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta, 1968.

Argyris, Chris. Integrating the Individual and the Organization. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.

Barnard, Chaster I. The Function of Executive . Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1954.

Bartunek, Jean M., and Christopher B. Keys. "Participation in School Decision Making." Urban Education, 14 (1979), 52-75.

Baum, Bernard H. Decentralization of Authority in a Bureaucracy. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1961.

Belasco, J.A., and J.A. Alutto. "Decisional Participation and Teacher's Satisfaction." Educational Administration Quarterly, 8 (1972), 44-58.

Belasco, J.A., Mike Milstein, and Paul Zaccarine. "Participation and Control: The Tannenbaum Hypothesis Revisited." Planning and Change, 6 (1976), 135-147.

Blau, Peter M. Exchange and Power in Social Life. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967.

Bossert, Steven T. "Classroom Structure and Teacher Authority." Education and Urban Society, 11, No. 1 (1978), 49-59.

Bridges, Edwin M. "Teacher Participation in Decision Making." Administrator's Notebook, 12, No. 9, 1964.

Bridges, Edwin M. "A Model for Shared Decision Making in the School Principalship." Educational Administration Quarterly, 3 (1967), 49-61.

Bridges, Edwin M. "Subjective and Objective Aspects of Demands for Involvement." Administrator's Notebook, 17, No. 6, 1969.

Bumbarger, C.S. "Decentralization--Pro and Con: Some Views about Decision-Making in Education." In Decentralizing Decision Making Within School Systems. Eds. Eugene W. Ratsoy and Donald Richards. Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, (1973), 62-78.

Campbell, R.F., and W.W. Wayson. "Decision-Making in the Elementary Principalship." National Elementary Principal, 41 (1962), 17-22.

Carson, Robert B., and John W. Friesen. Teacher Participation. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1978.

Cohen, Michael D., James G. March, and Johan P. Olsen. "A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice." Administrative Science Quarterly, 17 (1972), 1-25.

Chamberlain, John Lester. "The Opinions of Teachers and Principals on Teacher Participation in Decision Making." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1975.

Conway, J.A. "Test of Linearity Between Teacher's Participation in Decision Making and Their Perceptions of Their Schools as Organizations." Administrative Science Quarterly, 21 (1976), 130-139.

Conway, J.A. "The Myth, Mystery, and Mastery of Participative Decision Making in Education." Educational Administration Quarterly, 20, No. 3 (1984), 11-40.

Cox, Harold, and Wood, James R. "Organizational Structure and Professional Alienation: The Case of Public School teachers." Peabody Journal of Education, (October 1980) 1-6.

Corwin, Ronald G. "Professional Person in Public Organizations." Educational Administration Quarterly, 1, No. 3 (1965), 1-21.

Crockenberg, V., and W.W. Clark. "Teacher Participation in School Decision Making: The San Jose Teacher Involvement Project." Phi Delta Kappan, 61 (1979), 115-118.

Drucker, Peter F. The Effective Executive. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.

Dufty, N.F., and J.G. Williams. "Participation in Decision-Making." Journal of Educational Administration, 17, No. 1 (1979), 30-38.

Dykes, A.R. "Democracy, Teachers, and Educational Decision-Making." School and Society, 144 (1964), 155-156.

Eastcott, L.R. "Faculty Perceptions of and Preferences for Participation in Decision-Making." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta, 1975.

Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Flynn, W.C. "Collaborative Decision-Making in a Secondary School: An Experiment." Education and Urban Society, 8 (1976), 172-182.

Freidson, Eliot. "The Future of Professionalization." In Health and the Division of Labor. Eds. Margaret Stancey et al. London: Croom Helm, 1977.

Friesen, David, Edward A. Holdaway, and Alan W. Rice. "Satisfaction of School Principals with Their Work." Educational Administration Quarterly, 19, No. 4 (1983) 35-58.

Griffith, Francis. Administrative Theory in Education: Text and Readings. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing, 1979.

Griffiths, Daniel E. Administrative Theory. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959.

Griffiths, Daniel E. "Administration as Decision-Making." In Administrative Theory in Education. Ed. Halpin Andrew W. New York: Macmillan, 1967.

Griffiths, Daniel E. Organizing Schools for Effective Education. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1962.

Hall, Richard H. Organizations: Structure and Process. Elglewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1982.

Hasenfeld, Yeheskel. Human Service Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall. 1983.

Hersey, P., and K. Blanchard. Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources. 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1977.

Imber, Michael. "Increased Decision Making Involvement for Teachers: Ethical and Practical Considerations." The Journal of Educational Thought, 17, No. 1 (1983) 36-41.

Holdaway, Edward A. "Facet and Overall Satisfaction of Teachers." Educational Administration Quarterly, 14, No. 1 (1978), 30-47.

Holdaway, Edward A., John F. Newberry, David J. Hickson, and R. Peter Heron. "Dimensions of Organizations in Complex Societies: The Educational Sector." Administrative Science Quarterly, 20 (1975), 37-58.

Hoy, Wayne K., and Cecil G. Miskel. Educational Administration: Theory, Research, and Practice. New York: Random House, 1978.

Hoy, Wayne K., and Cecil G. Miskel. Educational Administration: Theory, Research, and Practice. 2nd ed. New York: Random House, 1982.

Hoy, Wayne K., and David A. Sousa. "Delegation: The Neglected Aspect of Participation in Decision Making." Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 30, No. 4, (1984), 320-331.

Isherwood, G.F., and R.M. Taylor. "Participatory Decision-Making Via School Councils." High School Journal, 61 (1978), 255-270.

Kaplan, H. Roy., and Curt Tausky. "Humanism in Organizations: A Critical Review." Public Administration Review, 37, No. 2 (1977), 171-180.

Katz, Daniel, and Robert L. Kahn. The Social Psychology of Organizations. 2nd rev. ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1978.

Keef, J.L. "Teacher Restlessness and Decision-Making." Clearing House, 52 (1979), 410-412.

Kelly, Joe. Organizational Behavior, Homewood, Illinois: Irwin, 1980.

Knoop, Robert and Robert R. O'Reilly. "Decision Making Procedures and Teacher Participation." Canadian Administrator, 17 (1977), 1-5.

Kunz, Daniel W., and Wayne K. Hoy. "Leadership Style of Principals and the Professional Zone of Acceptance of Teachers." Educational Administration Quarterly, 12, No. 3 (1976), 49-64.

Leavitt, Harold J. Managerial Psychology. 3rd rev. ed. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1972.

Likert, Rensis. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Lortie, Dan C. "The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School Teaching." In The Semi-Professions and Their Organization. Ed. Amitai Etzioni. New York: Free Press, 1969.

Louden, L. Warren. "Administrative Decision Making in Schools." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta, 1980.

Lowin, Aaron. "Participative Decision Making: A Model, Literature Critique, and Prescriptions for Research." Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 3 (1968), 68-106.

MacCrimmon, Kenneth R. "Managerial Decision Making." In Contemporary Management. Ed. Joseph W. McGuire. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

MacKay, David Allister. "An Empirical Study of Bureaucratic Dimensions and Their Relation to Other Characteristics of School Organizations." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta, 1964.

Mackay, D.A. "Should Schools Be Bureaucratic?" Canadian Administrator, 9 (1964), 5-8.

March, Milton E. "Variations in Degree of Control over Educational Decisions." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta, 1981.

Masse, Denis. "Teacher Participation and Professional Attitudes." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta, 1969.

Meyer, John W., and Brian Rowan. "The Structure of Educational Organizations." In Environments and Organizations. Eds. Marshall W. Meyer and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Miklos, E. "Increased Participation in Decision Making." Canadian Administrator, 9 (1970), 25-29.

Miles, R. "Human Relations or Human Resources?" Harvard Business Review, 43 (1965), 148-163.

Mintzberg, Henry. The Structuring of Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1979.

Miskel, Cecil, David McDonald, and Susan Bloom. "Structural and Expectancy Linkages within Schools and Organizational Effectiveness." Educational Administration Quarterly 19, No. 1 (1983), 49-82.

Mohrman, A.M.Jr., R.A. Cooke, and S.A. Mohrman. "Participation in Decision Making: Multidimensional Perspective." Educational Administration Quarterly, 14 (1978), 13-29.

Mouly, George J. Educational Research. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1978.

Mulder, M. "Power Equalization through Participation." Administrative Science Quarterly, 16 (1971), 31-38.

Muth, Rodney. "Toward an Integrative Theory of Power and Educational Organizations." Educational Administration Quarterly, 20, No. 2 (1984), 25-42.

Owens, Robert G. Organizational Behavior in Schools. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Peabody, Robert L. "Perceptions of Organizational Authority: A Comparative Analysis." Administrative Science Quarterly, 6 (1961), 463-482.

Perrow, Charles. "The Short and Glorious History of Organizational Theory." Organizational Dynamics, (Summer 1973), 3-15.

Piper, Donald L. "Decisionmaking: Decision made by Individual vs. Those Made by Group Consensus or Group Participation." Educational Administration Quarterly, 10 (1974), 82-95.

Pitkoff, Evan. Teacher Participation in School Decision Making. ERIC Ed 204 302, 1981.

Plaxton, R.P. and C.S. Bumbarger. "Participation and Power in Decision-Making Groups." Canadian Administrator, 7 (1973), 21-24.

Popham, W. James, and Kenneth A. Sirothik. Educational Statistics. 2nd rev. ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.

Ratsoy, E.W. "Decision-Making: Must It Be a Cooperative Activity?" Principal Leadership Course. Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, (1968), 9-16.

Ratsoy, E.W. "Participative and Hierarchical Management of Schools: Some Emerging Generalizations." Journal of Educational Administration, 11 (1973), 161-170.

Robbins, Stephen P. The Administrative Process. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1976.

Rogers, John H. Delegation of Authority. San Jose, Calif.: Lansford Publishing, 1974.

Rogers, Rolf E. Organizational Theory. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1975.

Royal, Raymond E. "Decision-Making in the Middle Echelons of Public Education." National Association of Secondary School Principal Bulletin, 45 (1961), 85-87.

Schein, Edger H. Organizational Psychology . 3rd rev. ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1980.

Schuttenberg, E.M., R.J. McArdole., and W. Thomas. "Goal Setting in Educational Organization: A Systems Perspective." Peabody Journal of Education, 56 (1979), 272-278.

Scott W. Richard. Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1981.

Scott, W. Richard, Sanford M. Dornbusch., Bruce C. Busching, and James D. Laing. "Organizational Evaluation and Authority." Administrative Science Quarterly, 12 (1967), 93-117.

Sharma, C.L. "Who Should Make What Decisions?" Administrative Notebook, 3, No. 8, 1955.

Sharples, Brian. "Rational Decision Making in Education: Some Concerns." Educational Administration Quarterly, 11 (1975), 55-65.

Silver, Paula. Educational Administration. New York: Harper and Row, 1983.

Simon, Herbert A. The New Science of Management Decision. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

Simon, Herbert A. Administrative Behavior. 2nd rev. ed. New York: Macmillan, 1961.

Simpkins, William Stewart. "The Distribution of Decision-Making Authority in the School." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta, 1968.

Simpkins, W.S., and D. Friesen. "Teacher Participation in School Decision-Making." Canadian Administrator, 8 (1969), 13-16.

Simpkins, W.S., and D. Friesen. "Discretionaly Powers of Classroom Teachers." Canadian Administrator, 9, No. 8 (1970), 35-38.

Sousa, David A., and Wayne K. Hoy. "Bureaucratic Structure in Schools: A Refinement and Synthesis in Measurement." Educational Administration Quarterly, 17, No. 4 (1981), 21-39.

Steers, Richard M. Organizational Effectiveness: A Behavioral View. Santa Monica, Cal: Goodyear, 1977.

Vroom, V.H., and A.G, Jago. "On the Validity of the Vroom-Yetton Model." Journal of Applied Psychology , 63 (1978), 151-162.

Whannell, R.A. "Participative Decision Making in Queensland State High Schools." Administrative Bulletin, 7 (1976), 1-4.

Weber, Max. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. Trans. A.M. Henderson and Talcott parson. New York: Free Press, 1947.

Weick, Karl E. "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems." Administrative Science Quarterly, 21 (1976), 1-9.

Wickstrom, R.A. "Participation Revisited: Who Decides When and How Much?" Canadian Administrator, 19 (1979), 1-4.

APPENDIX A. THE INSTRUMENT

A SURVEY OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF DECISION-MAKING AUTHORITY IN SCHOOLS

We would like to examine the distribution of decision-making authority as perceived and preferred by teachers in schools.

For the purpose of this study, a sample of Edmonton schools was selected. Your school was one of those chosen. We would appreciate your participation in the study by completing the following questionnaire. Your name should not appear anywhere on the questionnaire. Your school will not be identified in any way in the report of the findings. You are assured that all replies will remain confidential and anonymous.

Please place the completed questionnaire in the envelope provided, and return it to the staff member who has been designated to receive it. That person will forward all questionnaires from your school to us. Thank you for your cooperation.

PERSONAL DATA

Please circle the number of the appropriate answer which gives information about you.

1. School level

    1. Elementary school
    2. Junior high school
    3. Senior high school

2. Sex

    1. Male　　　2. Female

3. Years of teaching experience, counting the present year as a full year.

    1. 1 year
    2. 2-5 years
    3. 6-10 years
    4. 11-20 years
    5. 21 years or more

4. Years of training you are credited with for salary purposes.

    1. Less than 4 years
    2. Four years
    3. Five years
    4. Six years or more

AUTHORITY FOR DECISIONS IN SCHOOLS

Instructions

In this survey, teachers are asked to indicate **who decides** what action should be taken on specified issues. Teachers are asked for the actual and preferred degree of involvement in decision making by (a) the individual teacher, (b) the teacher staff group, and (c) the higher official authority.

FOR EACH ITEM, CIRCLE THE NUMBER WHICH YOU FEEL COMES CLOSEST TO DESCRIBING WHAT DOES HAPPEN AND WHAT SHOULD HAPPEN IN YOUR SCHOOL. THE NUMBERS CORRESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING RATINGS:

1 = **very low** involvement
2 = **low** involvement
3 = **moderate** involvement
4 = **high** involvement
5 = **very high** involvement

Example

In your school, assume that decisions have to be made about the task listed below. Please indicate the degree of actual and preferred involvement of the **INDIVIDUAL TEACHER** in the decision.

Task	**Actual and preferred involvement of the INDIVIDUAL TEACHER in the decision.**
1. Determining the way parents are informed of their children's progress.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5

In this example, the circle around **Actual 2** indicates a low teacher involvement, while the circle around **Preferred 4** indicates a high teacher preference of involvement in the decision.

Meaning of Terms

Individual Teacher refers to a classroom teacher.

A Teacher Staff Group refers to a formally recognized staff group such as the total school teaching staff, a subject area department staff, or a grade staff.

A Higher Official Authority refers to the administrative hierarchy above teachers, such as school principal, School Board or central office official, Department of Education or representative.

PART A

In your school, assume that decisions have to be made about the tasks listed below. Please indicate the degree of actual and preferred involvement of the **INDIVIDUAL TEACHER** in the decision.
Response Key: 1=very low, 2=low, 3=moderate, 4=high, 5=very high

Tasks	Actual and preferred involvement of the INDIVIDUAL TEACHER in the decision
1. Determination of the school's total program.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
2. Determination of the detailed content of the school's program.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
3. Determination of the texts and instructional material for various subjects.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
4. Determination of the way a subject is presented in class.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
5. Determination of frequency and methods of classroom testing.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
6. Determination of the relative friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
7. Determination of the size and composition of classes.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
8. Determination of the grading and promotion of students.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
9. Determination of the allocation of money to individuals and groups of teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
10. Determination of the teaching load and other duties of teachers.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
11. Determination of arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
12. Determination of school rules and regulations for the general student body.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
13. Determination of the nature of organized professional development activities.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
14. Determination of how teachers are to be evaluated.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
15. Determination of the expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5

PART B

In your school, assume that decisions have to be made about the tasks listed below. Please indicate the degree of actual and preferred involvement of a **TEACHER STAFF GROUP** in the decision.

Response Key: 1=very low, 2=low, 3=moderate, 4=high, 5=very high

	Tasks	**Actual and preferred involvement of a TEACHER STAFF GROUP in the decision**
1.	Determination of the school's total program.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
2.	Determination of the detailed content of the school's program.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
3.	Determination of the texts and instructional material for various subjects.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
4.	Determination of the way a subject is presented in class.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
5.	Determination of frequency and methods of classroom testing.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
6.	Determination of the relative friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
7.	Determination of the size and composition of classes.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
8.	Determination of the grading and promotion of students.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
9.	Determination of the allocation of money to individuals and groups of teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
10.	Determination of the teaching load and other duties of teachers.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
11.	Determination of arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
12.	Determination of school rules and regulations for the general student body.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
13.	Determination of the nature of organized professional development activities.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
14.	Determination of how teachers are to be evaluated.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
15.	Determination of the expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5

PART C

In your school, assume that decisions have to be made about the tasks listed below. Please indicate the degree of actual and preferred involvement of a **HIGHER OFFICIAL AUTHORITY** in the decision.
Response Key: 1=very low, 2=low, 3=moderate, 4=high, 5=very high

Tasks	**Actual and preferred involvement of a HIGHER OFFICIAL AUTHORITY in the decision**
1. Determination of the school's total program.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
2. Determination of the detailed content of the school's program.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
3. Determination of the texts and instructional material for various subjects.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
4. Determination of the way a subject is presented in class.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
5. Determination of frequency and methods of classroom testing.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
6. Determination of the relative friendliness of classroom teacher-student relationships.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
7. Determination of the size and composition of classes.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
8. Determination of the grading and promotion of students.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
9. Determination of the allocation of money to individuals and groups of teachers for instructional aids and equipment.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
10. Determination of the teaching load and other duties of teachers.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
11. Determination of arrangements for parents to discuss matters concerning their children's schooling.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
12. Determination of school rules and regulations for the general student body.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
13. Determination of the nature of organized professional development activities.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
14. Determination of how teachers are to be evaluated.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5
15. Determination of the expenditure patterns of school-based budgets.	Actual 1 2 3 4 5 Preferred 1 2 3 4 5

PART D

Please add any comments that you would like to make on the general topic of sharing responsibilities for decision making in education.

PART E

How satisfied are you with your involvement in decision making in your school? Please circle the number of the appropriate response below.

1. very dissatisfied
2. moderately dissatisfied
3. slightly dissatisfied
4. slightly satisfied
5. moderately satisfied
6. very satisfied

Any comments?

Thank you.

APPENDIX B. CORRESPONDENCE

EDMONTON PUBLIC SCH

September 14, 1984

Mr. W. A. Kiffiak
School Liaison Officer
Division of Field Services
The University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
T6G 2G5

Dear Mr. Kiffiak:

Re: Research Request - "Teachers' Perceptions of and Preferences for the Distribution of Decision-Making in the School" - Chan-young Chung

The above research request has been approved on a permissive basis following examination by our department.

Mr. Chung should now contact the principals of the schools listed on the following page to obtain final approval and to make the arrangements necessary for conducting the study.

We would appreciate receiving a copy of the results of the study as soon as they are available.

Sincerely,

T. A. Blowers, PhD
Director Program Review,
Research, Liaison

TAB/jmr

cc: ✓C. Chung
D. Friesen
Principals

CENTRE FOR EDUCATION, One Kingsway
Edmonton, Alberta T5H 4G9 Telephone (403) [illegible]

COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES PROGRAM

1. Instructions

a) This application form is to be used for research projects only. Research is defined here as a major undertaking leading to a Master's thesis or a Ph.D. dissertation, or studies of similar nature in magnitude.

b) A copy of the ethical guidelines for research is included with this application. This document together with the request is to be reviewed jointly by the project initiator with his/her department chairman or designate to ensure that the project complies with the ethical guidelines. His/her signature, page 2, item 8, is needed to indicate that this requirement has been met.

2. Organization to be Involved

Edmonton Public School System ☒
Edmonton Catholic School System ☐
N.A.I.T. ☐
County of Strathcona ☐
St. Albert Protestant/Separate School System ☐

3. Requestor (University staff member)

Date Sep. 11, 1984
Name (include title) Dr. D. Friesen
Faculty Education
Position Professor
Department Educational Administration
Address University of Alberta
Telephone 432-3690

If request is being made on behalf of graduate student indicate Chan-young Chung
(Name)

Dept. of Ed. Admin. Faculty of Education, U. of A., Edmonton T6G 2G5 432-3690
(University address) (University Telephone)

(If university address is unavailable, please give complete home address, including postal code.)

Ph.D. student ☒ Master's student ☐ Other ☐

4. Description of Research Project - include title, objectives, procedure, evaluation, techniques, etc.

Title:
TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF AND PREFERENCES FOR THE DISTRIBUTION OF DECISION-MAKING AUTHORITY IN THE SCHOOL

Objectives:
To determine the distribution of decision-making authority regarding fifteen important task activities associated with the operation of the school instructional program, as perceived and preferred by teachers in elementary, junior high, and senior high schools in Edmonton.

Procedures and Techniques:

(1) With approval of this study, the researcher will contact the principals of selected sample schools to obtain final approval and to make the necessary arrangements for the study.
(2) The sample for the study will be: five elementary, five junior high, and five senior high schools in the Edmonton Public School System.

(3) Data for the study will be gathered from questionnaires which teachers in the sample schools could complete in less than half an hour.

(4) No names are required and data analysis will be carried out by computer. Therefore, all replies will remain completely anonymous.

5. Anticipated value to university participant:

The study will provide some new information on the distribution of decision-making authority, and perhaps some insights into the structure of authority in school organizations.

6. Anticipated value to cooperating organization:

The information on the distribution of decision-making authority as perceived and preferred by teachers may be useful for administrators to make an attempt to maintain the stabilization and flexibility of school organizations.

7. Suggested personnel, schools and times:

I would be grateful if Authority Concerned would recommend five elementary, five junior high, and five senior high schools which meet the following conditions:

(1) schools with a minimum of fifteen regular classroom teachers.

(2) schools which organize instruction on the self-contained classroom.

Data Collection: October and November, 1984

ommended Schools

---

8. Approved by Department Chairman OR Designate

David Friesen
Signature

Sep. 11, 1984
Date

For Office Use Only:

Approved by ____________, Field Services Date September /84

Approved by T. Blowers Date Sept 14/84

Subject to the following conditions:

(a) A report of the results of findings of this project is required by the cooperating school system (check one) yes ☒ no ☐

(b) Other

c/o Dr. D. Friesen
Dept. of Educational Administration
The University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
T6G 2G5

September 26, 1984

Dear

I am a doctoral student in Educational Administration at the University of Alberta. As part of my program of studies, I am undertaking an investigation into the distribution of decision-making authority regarding fifteen important task activities associated with the operation of the school instructional program, as perceived and preferred by teachers in elementary, junior high, and senior high schools in Edmonton.

For the purpose of the study, a sample of schools was selected. Your school was one of those chosen. I have the permission of the superintendent of your school system to seek the participation of you and your staff in the project.

The data for the study will be gathered from a questionnaire which teachers could complete in less than half an hour. No names are required and data analyses will be done by computer. No school will be identified in any way in the report of the findings. Therefore, you can be sure that all replies will remain completely anonymous.

If you and your staff agree to participate in the study, necessary materials will be forwarded to your school before the end of October. May I have the participation of you and your staff in the project?

Would you let me have your reply to this request by checking your response on the attached sheet and forwarding it to me as soon as possible? Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Chan-young Chung
Ph.D. student

October , 1984

School:

Please circle the appropriate answer.

Participation

1. Yes
2. No

Please indicate the number of regular classroom teachers in your school.

_____________ teachers.

Signature: __________________

c/o Dr. D. Friesen
Dept. of Educational Administration
The University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta

October 22, 1984

Dr. T. A. Blowers
Director Program Review
Research, Liaison
Edmonton Public Schools
Edmonton, Alberta
T5H 4G9

Dear Dr. Blowers:

This letter is related to your letter of permission (September 14, 1984) of the study, "Teachers' Perceptions of and Preferences for the Distribution of Decision-Making Authority in Schools."

I greatly appreciate that you recommended the fifteen schools for the study. I sought the participation of the recommended schools in the project. However, I have not obtained approval from two elementary, two junior high, and one senior high schools among them.

Would you please recommend two elementary, two junior high, and one senior high schools which meet the following conditions:
(1) schools with a minimum of fifteen full-time classroom teachers.
(2) schools which organize instruction on the self-contained classroom.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Chan-young Chung
Ph.D. student

EDMONTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO SUPERINTENDENT

ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENTS

October 23, 1984

Chan-Young Chung
c/o Dr. D. Friesen
Dept. of Educational Administration
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
T6G 2G5

Dear Mr. Chung:

Re: Research Request : Teachers' Perseptions of and Preferences for the Distribution of Decision Making Authority in the Schools

In response to your letter of October 14, 1984, we suggest you contact the principals of the following schools and obtain their approval to participate in your study:

Sincerely,

Tom Blowers, PhD
Director Program Review,
Research, Liaison

cc. Dr. Friesen
Mr. Kiffiak
Principals

TAB/pt

CENTRE FOR EDUCATION, One Kingsway
Edmonton, Alberta T5H 4G9 Telephone (403) 429-8000

c/o Dr. D. Friesen
Dept. of Educational Administration
The University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
T6G 2G5

November 12, 1934

Dear

Thank you very much for your acceptance to participate in the study, "Teachers' Perceptions of and Preferences for the Distribution of Decision-Making Authority in Schools."

The questionnaires for your staff are being mailed today under separate cover. While the questionnaires are being sent to the school in your name, you may prefer to have a staff member distribute them to teachers and receive them when the questionnaires have been completed.

It would be greatly appreciated if all questionnaires would be completed and returned within ten days or so. Perhaps a date for completion might be set by the staff member responsible for receiving them, and then the person should mail the questionnaires to me. No school will be identified in any way in the report of findings, and all replies will remain confidential and anonymous.

Thank you very much for your help and cooperation. I really appreciate your assistance.

Sincerely,

Chan-young Chung
Ph.D. student

c/o Dr. D. Friesen
Dept. of Educational Administration
The University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
T6G 2G5

January 11, 1985

Dear

Thank you very much for your help in returning the questionnaires completed by your staff. If there are any questionnaires that have not been returned yet, would you please let me have them as soon as possible? I urgently need to have returns from more teachers in your school. Consequently, I enclose copies for those teachers who may have not yet completed the questionnaire.

Thank you very much for your help and consideration. I really appreciate your assistance.

Sincerely,

Chan-young Chung
Ph.D. student

c/o Dr. D. Friesen
Dept. of Educational Administration
The University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
T6G 2G5

January 10, 1985

Dear

Thank you very much for your help in returning the questionnaires completed by your staff. If there are any questionnaires that have not been returned yet, would you please let me have them as soon as possible?

I greatly appreciate an allotment of precious time for your staff to complete the questionnaires. Would you convey mey thanks to your staff for their cooperation?

I wish that you and your staff have a happy new year.

Sincerely,

Chan-young Chung
Ph.D. student